



तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

905

JDL

११६




JOURNAL
OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF LETTERS

University of Calcutta

Journal
of the
Department of Letters

Vol. XVI



CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS
1927

PRINTED BY BHUPENDRALAL BANERJEE
AT THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS, SENATE HOUSE, CALCUTTA.

Reg. No. 301_B. J.—July, 1927—F.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
1. An Introduction to the Post-Chaitanya Sahajiyā Cult, by Manindramohan Bose, M.A. ...	1—162
2. The Poet Kalidas and Sea-Voyage, by Rai Pankaja Kumar Chatterji, Bahadur, M.A., B.L.	1—14
3. Date of Kavikankan Mukundarām Cakravartī, by Basantakumar Chatterjee, M.A. ...	15—22
4. Padāvalī Literature—Vidyāpati, by Basanta- kumar Chatterjee, M.A.	23—54
5. The Padas of Caṇḍidāsa, by Manindramohan Bose, M.A.	55—80
6. The Aryabhatiyam (<i>A translation</i>), by Prabodh Chandra Sengupta, M.A.	1—56
7. Note on the Library of Abdur Rahim Khan Khanan, the First Prime Minister of the Emperor Akbar, by Shamsul-Ulama Hafiz Nazir Ahmad Khan Sahib	57—62
8. The Nyāya Doctrine of Pramāṇa, by Satis Chandra Chatterji, M.A. ,,, ...	1—62
9. Early History of Bengal (Sena Period), by Girindra Mohan Sarkar, M.A. ...	1—82

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE POST-CHAITANYA SAHAJIĀ CULT

I

INTRODUCTION

The Sahajiā doctrine is a popular creed of Bengal, though it is not so very familiar to the educated classes. It may properly be called the doctrine of the masses, and there is hardly any important village in this part of India which does not supply a few followers to the creed. In the backwoods of Bengal the Sahajiās, under various names, have considerable hold upon the common people, men and women alike. The reason of such extensive popularity of the sect is not far to seek. Many Sahajiās have pretension to quackery and are popularly believed to be possessed of extraordinary healing power, so people, mostly women from the lower strata of the society, flock to them for an easy cure of ailments of all sorts. Besides, in the social gatherings that are periodically held by the Sahajiās, women enjoy absolute liberty, which is a great incentive to the common people, specially women, to attend such functions in large numbers. We have seen females, young, old and widows, of other sects also coming to the meeting-place from a great distance in the company of initiated converts for no other purpose than to enjoy some freedom from home-life and its environments. Sahajiā, in fact, is a revolt against Hindu orthodoxy. It places women in a plane of absolute freedom and the attractions it thus affords to the tender sex of the community brought up in an atmosphere of complete thralldom have the magic effect of inviting them to the secret meetings held by the leaders of the sect. Though we cannot give exact statistics, there is no doubt that a large number of people attend the festivities of the sect. At Ghoshpārā alone one lakh of visitors are said to participate in the function and by far the largest number

of them consists of women. In Bengal the Sahajīās have important centres at Ghoshpārā, Rāmkeli, Nadia, Sāntipur, Khardā, Kendukī, and several other villages in the districts of Midnāpur, Birbhūm and Bānkurā.

The sect possesses a vast literature interesting in many respects, but its circulation is mainly confined to the followers of the sect, for the Sahajīā writers enjoin strictest secrecy about their religious works. The literature of the cult is mostly preserved in manuscript forms in the huts of the followers of the sect, inaccessible to those outside the pale of their religion, but the printed copies of many important books of the creed are now available owing to the vigilant activities of the Baṭtollā presses. It is not possible to state with certain accuracy the number of books that have already seen the light in this way, but the names of about one hundred are found mentioned in the catalogues of Vaishnava works and there must be many hundreds more still unknown to the public which, when published, will be a valuable acquisition to the study of Indian religious literature. Many of the books are written in what is called the *Sāndhyā Bhāṣhā*, i.e., in mystic language with technicalities couched in words of obscure meaning. One thing, however, cannot escape the observation of even the most cursory reader of these books. Most of the Sahajīā writers allude to some earlier Vaishṇava authorities from whose writings they acknowledge to have received the necessary inspiration. Krishnadās Kavirāj, Narottama, Raghunāth Dās and Rūp Goswāmi are very often found mentioned in these books. This proves without doubt that they deal with the Sahajīā cult of the Post-Chaitanya period only. There is still another point which is worthy of special notice in this connection. The Sahajīā books were written both in prose and verse, and the prose works like *Jñānādi Sādhana* and the documents relating to a public debate between Rādhāmohon Thākur and the opponents of the sect, in which the former established the superiority of the Parakīyā system, are excellent specimens of earlier Bengali prose writings which have been traced to the beginning of the 18th century. It is thus evident that these Sahajīā writers have done a great service to the Bengali literature by giving expositions of their religious beliefs in prose—a unique feature in the writings of the old writers of Bengal.

The Sahajīās are divided into various sects of which Āul, Bāul, Shāī, Darbesh, Neṛā and Sahajis are prominent Sahajīā sects. in Bengal. In their association with women for religious practices, they have preserved the true character of the Sahajīā doctrine. Many other sects, such as, •Gaurabādi, Kartābhajā, Sāhebhdhani, Hazrati, Gobrai, Pāgalnāthi, Sakhibhābak, Spasṭadāyak, Kishoribhajanis, Rāmballavis and Jaganmohinis, may also be classified with them for their free association with women. In social customs, religious beliefs, and manner of worship they are quite different from one another, for these sects owe their origin under different circumstances to persons of different culture and thought and so they now form a society of heterogeneous units. The chief characteristics of a few sects are noted below. I shall, however, try to give a clear and full exposition of the tenets of each of them later on :—

Āul, Bāul, Neṛā and Sahajis believe that both Rādhā and Krishna are present in the human body and that they can be realised through the love of men and women. They do neither worship images nor observe fasts. They do not shave but tie up the hair in the form of a knot over the head. The Bāuls observe a mystic process called the “piercing of the four moons” just like the “piercing of the six lotuses” practised by the Tāntriks. Each of these sects, it should be understood, has the theories and practices, as noted above, in regard to sexual relationship which are sometimes based on Tāntrik doctrine where physical cravings are attempted to be subdued by physical methods as enumerated in their codes, but oftener the relationship soars in a higher plane of emotional felicities.

Gaurabādīs.—They believe that both Rādhā and Krishna incarnated themselves in the person of Chaitanya, so Chaitanya is superior to either of them. They worship the image of Chaitanya Deva.

Darbesh.—The names of Mahommed, Allā and Khodā are found in their mantras of worship. Though they have introduced some other exotic elements in their creed, it must be clearly understood that they did not thereby surrender their own religion. It was more or less a matter of policy on their part to take loan of the views of other sects in order to popularise their own creed.

• *Shāī*.—They are like the Darbesh sect. They even eat beef and drink wine.

Kṛitābhajās.—Āulehānd who is the founder of the sect is regarded by its followers to be one with Krishna and Chaitanya.

Rāmballavis.—They believe in every Śāstra and read the Gītā, the Bible, and the Koran at the time of festivities. This creed consists of a hotchpotch of beliefs akin to cosmopolitanism in religion.

Jaganmohinis.—They have no faith in idol worship. They recite the name of Brahmā. Their religious songs are called Nirvāṇa songs.

From the above it is quite clear that the modern Sahajīā doctrine is a mixed creed. The influences of Hinduism, Vaishnavism, Tāntrikism, Buddhism, Mahomedanism and even of Christianity can be traced in the body of this religion. Unlike other orthodox creeds of this country the Sahajīās, it will thus appear, have kept their portals open for receiving light from outside. This was essential for the popularisation of their doctrine amongst the masses which now consist of a mixed population, *viz.*, Christians, Hindus and Mahomedans. They could not approach the Śāktas as the latter represented strictly orthodox views and would not allow outsiders within their fold. The other three sects, *viz.*, the Vaishnavas, Mahomedans and Christians, open the doors of brotherhood to all men and hence they justly incorporated their doctrines in their own religious codes, so that they could enlist these religionists in their own sect. In this respect, they have shown a liberal spirit which is justly the pride of every even-minded man of the present age. It is wonderful how these common people could work on such liberal principles when the educated classes of the country confined themselves to the observance of the strict rules of the Śāstras. To rise above the confines of castes and prejudices is not an easy matter in this country, but the Sahajīās laid the foundation of what may be called a true universal religion unthought of even by the most advanced reformers of the world.

The most characteristic feature of the Sahajīā doctrine is that it advocates the company of women in religious practices. The Hindus also perform certain household duties with duly married wives, but there is this difference that women here retain their recognised position as handmaids of men and occupy a subordinate status. With the Sahajīās, however, they are the objects of worship and associates of secret practices for which other men's wives are thought to be the best media. In the Hindu Śāstras there are often strict

Association with women.

injunctions against all association with women. To mention only a few, the *Mahābhārata* devotes a whole chapter to the enumeration of the bad qualities of women, and in the *Yogavāsistha Rāmāyaṇa* women are spoken of as great impediments to higher spiritual culture.¹ Buddha himself was against the taking of women into the fold of the Saṅghas and Chaitanya Deva also held the same view. "Forsake women and gold" is the common advice that is poured into the ears of a disciple by a Guru in order to chalk out for him the path of emancipation. But the Sahajīās have gone to the extreme point in an other direction. They not only advocate the company of women, but say that women are absolutely necessary for religious practices. The Tāntriks also hold the same view, but there is this difference that women are by them regarded as the means of performing certain formal practices in which the necessity of tender feelings is completely ignored. But the Sahajīās advocate the company of women through love and for love. This emotional side of the creed most probably originated in the Buddhist Saṅghas. In the

The emotional side. association of Bhikshus and Bhikshunis the arrows of Cupid found field of play, and the inevitable tendency of flesh and blood asserted itself in the union of men and women. But the Bhikshus were learned men, who, being unable to check the growth of this vile corruption, tried to utilise this love for the attainment of emotional perfection. Therein most probably lies the germ of peculiar Sahajīā practices so very unique in themselves.

The theory of the religious practices of the Sahajīās is based upon spiritual emancipation. It is so described in a

The theory of religious practices.

nutshell in *Jñānādi Sādhana* :—

"Next, the Sādbu (pious Guru) out of his kindness aroused spiritual consciousness in that ignorant disciple, and made (the properties of) soul visible (as it were) to him. Then in his left ear he whispered the Chaitanya mantra (lit. the mantra or the sacred words of "the enlightened one"): He also explained the true meaning of this mantra. Next he pointed out to his disciple the true nature of the body with ten senses. This physical body, he proved consisted of permanent elements. He then proceeded to show

¹ Narada—*Panchachurā Saṃvāda*, *Mahābhārata*, Chapter XXXII. *Yogavāsistha Rāmāyaṇa*, *Vairāgya Prakaraṇa*, Chapter XXI.

how in the Sādhaka stage (*i.e.*, in the first stage of spiritual trainings), form and beauty are attributed to Krishna and how in the final stage of Siddhi, when the spiritual soul is emancipated, Krishna appears in a quite different light. When a man passes through these stages he can attain the state of beatitude based on the perfection of his emotions. " ¹

Cardinal points.

Here, we have the cardinal points of the Sahajīā doctrine. A Sahajīā should—

- (I) be initiated before a Guru,
- (II) know his own soul,
- (III) pass through various stages of spiritual life,
- (IV) and know his own body in order to attain the state of beatitude based on the perfection of his emotions. We shall now deal with these items separately.

I. INITIATION BEFORE A GURU.

The Sahajīās pay great importance to the initiation before a Guru. Unless a man receives instruction from a well-chosen Guru, he cannot be successful in religious practices. The Gurus are of two kinds—(i) The Dīkshā Guru or the Guru of initiation and (ii) the Śikshā Guru or the Guru who guides his disciple carefully in religious practices. At first a man should be initiated before a Guru and act according to his advice. He should seek the company of pious men as directed by his Guru, and practise the mantras he receives at the time of initiation. This is called the Nāmāśraya or Mantrāśraya stage, *i.e.*, the first stage of religious life. Here he should also observe religious practices in 64 kinds called the Vaidhi mode of worship. But as soon as he rises above the level of karma, he should pass into the Sādhaka stage or the second stage of religious life. Here he should follow a Śikshā Guru, *i.e.*, one who can guide him in religious practices. When he rises higher, he passes into the Siddha stage or the final stage of religious life which is based upon

¹ পরে সেই সাধু রূপা করিয়া সেই অজ্ঞানজনকে চৈতন্য করিয়া তাহার শরীরের মধ্যে জীবাত্মাকে প্রত্যক্ষ দেখাইয়া পরে তাহার বাম কর্ণেতে ত্রিচৈতন্য মন্ত্র কহিয়া পরে সেই চৈতন্য মন্ত্রের অর্থ জনাইয়া পরে সেই জীব ঠাৱাএ দশ ইন্দ্রিয় আদি যুক্ত নিত্য শরীর দেখাইয়া পরে সাধক অভিমানে ত্রীকৃষ্ণাদির রূপ আরোপ চিন্তাতে দেখাইয়া পরে সিদ্ধ অভিমানে ত্রীকৃষ্ণাদির মূর্তি পৃথক দেখাইয়া প্রেম লক্ষণার সমাধি ভক্তিতে স্থাপন করিলেন।

the perfection of emotions. Thus the necessity of a Dikshā and a Śikshā Guru is here clearly set forth. In fact, the whole process of spiritual improvement is based upon the instruction of the Guru.

It is generally believed that the Sahajīās strive to attain the final stage of perfection without passing through the other preparatory stages. But their theological works, as noted above, tell a different tale. Vaidhī mode of worship is here said to be the chief characteristic of the Pravarta stage or the first stage of religious life. It is only when a man, after passing through the first two stages rises on a higher level, that he forsakes the Vaidhī mode of worship and seeks to realise God by love alone.

Vaidhī Sādhana advocated.

The idea of Guru has been further developed by the Sahajīās. Guru is sometimes identified with Paramātmā or the Supreme Lord of all. It is even said that the flute of Krishna was the Guru of the Gopis.

Guru identified with Paramātmā.

In the highest conception, a Guru is said to be the chief source of emotion under the impulse of which a man advances in religious life. From the above it is clear that the Guru according to this conception is not an ordinary man but a noble idea embodied in the man. After all, a Guru, either in flesh and blood or in the form of an emotion, is the true guide of a man in religious life.

II. HUMAN SOUL.

The soul is not subject to any change. The human body should not be identified with the man himself, but it is something else which can lay claim to that appellation. The term is really applicable to soul which experiences no birth and death. The soul is quite different from God, but it is so rich in potentialities that even the Lord of Goloka constantly thinks about it. It is the master of nine senses who are merely the instruments of it. So long as the soul feels the existence of the external world it remains, as it were, dead, but when the world vanishes, it revives. The soul is in the world and the world is in the soul. In order to establish itself, it must hold the external world in contemptuous neglect. True consciousness

Human Soul.

really dawns upon a man as soon as darkness, both internal and external, vanishes before him.¹

Here we have the echoes of the Hindu philosophical works like the Upanishads and the Gītā, but for the purpose of attaining true consciousness, the Sahajīās follow a different path. The Hindu Śāstras advocate the extinction of senses in order to rescue the soul from their evil tendencies, but the Sahajīās advocate the training of senses for the attainment of spiritual goal.

The subject of spiritual emancipation is dealt with allegorically in the excellent book named *Amritarasāvalī*, the substance of which is stated below:—

“Ātmā or human soul was in the keeping of Paramātmā or God who had a pond of ambrosia guarded by sentinels. One day Ātmā with his nine lieutenants (of which five are outer senses, namely, eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin, and the four are inner senses, namely, mind, intelligence, pride and heart) went to steal in the pond. The Ātmā was there made a captive by the guards, but the nine senses turned back. As soon as the Ātmā was thus free from the influence of senses, he became free from captivity and the illusions of the world vanished before him. But the nine senses made a fruitless search after him and at last became ascetics on the bank of a river. There a beautiful damsel, evidently love, appeared to them one day and one among the nine, probably mind, was captivated by her charms, who then followed her. But the remaining eight senses continued to live on the bank of the river, where Ātmā one day revealed himself before them in human form. They became extremely glad to find him again, and the three inner senses went to Paramātmā

“তি’হ হন নির্জিকার তার বিকার নাই।”—*Amritarasāvalī*.

“নরবপু দেহ এই মানুষ আকার।

সে মানুষ অনেক দূর এ মানুষের পার।

জন্মমৃত্যু নাহি তার নহে সে ঈশ্বর।

গোলোকের পতি যারে ভাবে নিরন্তর।”—*Ibid.*

“নয়জনা তার মধ্যে তি’হ যে সর্দার।”—*Ibid.*

“জগত বাচিলে আমি সে মরি।

জগত ডুবিলে আমি সে তরি।

আমাতে জগত জগতে আমি।

আমাকে করিতে জগত কমি।”—*Ibid.*

“বাহুর আকার মনের আকার দুই কৈল নাশ।

নাশ হইলে তি’হ করেন প্রকাশ।”—*Ibid.*

to inform him about the return of Ātmā. Paramātmā came and exhorted Ātmā to come back to his keeping, but he refused. Thereupon he returned with the three inner senses. The five outer senses remained with Ātmā who trained them completely and he reached the Sahajīā goal with them."

Here we have the essence of the Sahajīā doctrine. God is not, with the Sahajīās, the object of realisation. The inner senses should go in quest after God. The Sahajīā goal is to be reached by the training of the outer senses and not by destroying their functions as is prescribed in the Hindu Śāstras. Thus to the Sahajīās, God has fallen on the background and Ātmā has gained prominence. This is also the explanation of the well-known passage of Chandidās that man is supremely great, there is nothing greater.¹

III.—VARIOUS STAGES OF SPIRITUAL LIFE.

The Sahajīās have adopted the Vaishṇava idea of various stages of spiritual life with slight modifications. The spiritual life of a man is divided into three stages, namely, Pravarta or the first stage, Sādhaka or the middle stage and Siddha or the final stage of perfection. The Pravarta stage is sometimes called the Taṭastha stage which is further subdivided into four finer sections. In the first quarter of this stage reverence arises in mind, in the second quarter one enjoys the company of pious men, in the third quarter he practises various methods of worship and in the fourth quarter he assumes the true character of a Sādhaka. The Sādhaka stage is also divided into three sub-sections attributing special peculiarities to each.

The manner of worship in the three stages is also quite different. A man in the Pravarta stage should recite the names of Hari, in the Sādhaka stage recount the five names of Kṛishṇa² and in the Siddha stage worship by Kāmavij and Kāma Gāyatrī.³

¹ "শুনে মানুষ তাই। সবার উপর মানুষ সত্য, তাহার উপর নাই।"—Song No. 809 of the Pariṣad Edition.

² ক্রীং কৃষ্ণার গোবিন্দার গোপীজনবল্লভার বাহা।—Gopālatāpanī.

³ Kāmavij is simply ক্রীং, but Kāma Gāyatrī is নমঃ কামদেবার সর্বজন প্রিয়র সর্বজন সন্মোহনার জল জল প্রজ্জল প্রজ্জল সর্বজনন্ত হৃদয়ং মে বশং কুরু কুরু বাহা।—Gopālatāpanī.

From the Pravarta stage a worshipper can realise Chaitanya Deva, from the Sādhaka stage Rādhā and from the Siddha stage Kṛishna,

Now, about the philosophy underlying the conception of the three stages. By recounting the names of Hari, one can get rid of sin. A man in the Taṭastha stage can not advance to the Sādhaka stage so long as sin remains in him. He can alone get rid of sin who is not influenced by the attractions of the external world. So, a man in the Sādhaka stage must be above such attractions, but if he falls a prey to them, he returns to the Taṭastha stage. He, who constantly remains in the Taṭastha stage throughout 24 hours, is always subject to recurring births and deaths according to his own acts. But he who is always above worldly affairs, can attain the next perfect stage of Siddhi.¹

The necessity of passing through various stages is explained after the manner of the Chaitanyacharitāmṛita. A man must pass through various stages in order to get rid of bad tendencies. As soon as a man is free from such tendencies, Bhakti arises in his mind. This Bhakti leads to Ruchi, Ruchi to Āsakti, deep Āsakti to Bhāva and Bhāvā to Prema.

Of the five kinds of Āśrayas, Nāma and Mantra are attributed to the Pravarta stage, Bhāva to Sādhaka stage, and Rasa and Prema to Siddha stage. So also among the five Rāgas, Nāma and Sradhā are attributed to the first stage, Līlā to the middle stage and Prema and Prāpti to the final stage.

Pravarta is justly called the stage of regulating one's activities, and Sādhaka, the stage of mental purification.

মন্ত্র হরিনামেতে কলুষ হয় ক্ষয়
কলুষ থাকিতে সাধ্য সাধক না হয় ॥
অতএব সাধক হৈলে বাহু নাহি রয় ।
বাহু হৈলে পুন তাকে তটস্থ ঘটয় ॥
অতএব তটস্থ যার অহোরাত্রি থাকে ।
কৰ্মহস্তে লয়ে তাকে ফিরে পাকে পাকে ॥
সতত থাকয়ে যার বাহু রহিত ।

সিদ্ধের সহিত তার সেবায়ে মোহিত ॥—Rasasāra, pp. 1-2

ASSOCIATION WITH WOMEN.

A knowledge of this is absolutely necessary in order to understand the doctrine of the Sahajīās and the peculiar practices observed by them. We shall therefore enter into details and take up the subject point by point. It is well-known that the most noteworthy feature of the Sahajīā doctrine is that it advocates the company of women in religious practices. The Sahajīā writers have tried to explain this peculiar custom in more than one way. Though they approached the problem from different standpoints, it will not be difficult to find out how the theories advanced by them are co-related with one another.

The first theory is based upon the conception of the three stages of religious life mentioned before. It has been

The first theory. hinted there that in the Pravartā stage, *i.e.*, the first stage of religious life, a worshipper should observe certain formal practices according to the prescribed rules of religious code. By the careful observance of these rules, he can go to the Sādhaka stage, *i.e.*, the second stage of religious life. At this stage, he should consider himself to be a woman, and should remember that he cannot get true love so long as he cannot realise the true nature of a woman in him. In order to attain the higher stage of perfection he should now practise Rasa and Prema, *i.e.*, love successfully, and when he reaches the final stage of purification, his adopted nature of a woman should again be transformed into the nature of a man. Unless one passes through these stages, one cannot get the idea of the transcendental thing called true love.¹

সাধি তত্ত্বদেহে হই সাধক প্রকৃতি ।
 স্বভাব প্রকৃতি হৈলে তবে রাগরতি ।
 প্রকৃতি পুরুষ হয় দেহান্তর হৈলে ।
 রসাত্ম্য প্রেমাত্ম্য সাধন করিলে ।—Amritaratnāvali.

Also প্রকৃতি আচার পুরুষ বেতার
 জে জনা জানিতে পারে ।—Amritarasāvali.

And আপনি পুরুষ প্রকৃতি হইবে
 etc., etc., etc.—Rasasāra, p. 47.

Now, the question is why should a worshipper in the second stage try to realise the true nature of a woman? The solution is simply this. We know that love with the Sahajīās is the watchword, and this love, like all other tender feelings, is the natural inheritance of women. Woman is, therefore, taken as a companion for no other purpose than to make the female nature easier for adaptation. By constant companion with woman, it is not at all difficult for a critical observer to measure her depth of feeling and to realise what true love is. An example is better than precept; we can know about love more easily by being loved than by reading and hearing about it in thousand other ways. This is the essence of the spirit of the Sahajīā doctrine at a certain stage. It advocates, as the name (Sahajīā) itself indicates, the easiest means of attaining perfection. It could therefore prescribe no easier mode of creating love in the hearts of the devotees than this.

The Sahajīās are not singular in this unique conception. The following quotation from a saint of the west will be more convincing. Newman says, "If thy soul is to go on into higher spiritual blessedness, it must become a woman, yes, however manly thou may be among men." To love God with the intensity of female affection is the keynote to this conception. To the Vaiṣṇavas this idea is perfectly familiar; indeed, the Vaiṣṇava songs teach nothing more than this. The life of Chaitanya Deva is the practical illustration of this principle.

The Sahajīās hope to effect spiritual emancipation through love only. So their first concern is to create love in

The second theory. the mind. The easiest means to do so, is to

love a woman who by nature can easily captivate the heart of a man. No matter, if this love is at first very gross in character, it may gradually lead to the highest perfection. The story of Vilvamangala can be cited in support of this view. But among women, those who are closely related can create little passion in the heart of a man, and hence restrictions have been imposed in civilised societies upon the selection of a bride. But the Sahajīās have gone to the utmost limit in this respect. With them there is no restriction whatsoever. They declare

The selection of
Parakiyā explained.

that whoever by beauty can captivate the heart
of a man, should be taken as a companion.

Follow the dictates of passion blindly, for your object is not to

legalise the sexual union, but to create love in the mind, which by gradual evolution will lead to the highest perfection.¹

In this theory of evolution the Sahajīās have adopted the classification of emotions as narrated in the *Classifications of emotions.* Chaitanyacharitāmrita. Emotions are of 8 kinds, namely, Rati, Prema, Sneha, Māna, Praṇaya, Rāga, Anurāga and Mahābhāva. Each of them has been further sub-divided into four finer parts, making up a total of 32 in all. But among the principal 8 kinds of emotions, Rati is said to be the root of the other seven which are gradually traced to the evolution of this Rati. Just as from the seed grows sugar-cane which yields juice from which molasses is made, and from molasses can be prepared sugar, sugar-candy, Sitā and Sitotpalā, so from Rati grow Prema, Sneha, Māna, Praṇaya, Rāga, Anurāga, and Mahābhāva which is the highest stage of perfection. So Rati is like the seed from which the tree of emotions grows. One should therefore implant this seed in the mind, if one wishes to attain spiritual emancipation.

The third theory is based upon restoring a state of equilibrium to the mind. In the religious practices of any kind, it is of paramount importance that the mind of the devotee should rest in peace. But what does disturb the balance of mind? Among countless causes, animal passion is most powerful. It is the most powerful enemy of man which is always lurking in the body of flesh and

রূপ লাভণ্য যার দেখি জন্মে কোভ ।
 প্রাপ্তি কারণে সদা চিন্তে হয় লোভ ।
 পূর্ধ্বরাগের ঘর এই সদা চিন্ত মনে ।
 বিংশতি দ্বাদশ রস ইহার পোষক ॥—Rasasāra, p. 13.
 প্রথমত রতিভাব বীজবত কর ॥
 তদুপরি হয় প্রেম ইন্দুবৎ সম ।
 স্নেহ হয় রস তার এই অমৃতম ।
 মানে শুভবৎ হয় শুনহ বচন ।
 প্রনয় খণ্ড সম করি যে গনন ॥
 রাগ বারে বলি শর্করাবৎ হয় ।
 তদুপরি অনুরাগ সিংহবৎ কর ॥
 তদুপরি মহাভাব সিংহবৎপলাবৎ ॥—Rasasāra, p. 29.

blood.¹ Now, the question is how can a man get the better of such an evil passion? Austere practices calculated to torture this body can subdue this passion to some extent, but the Sahajīās advocate what they call the easiest means to gain the end. To live in retirement, hear sermons and submit to physical hardships, is like the attempt to shut the mouth of a volcano to stop its irruptions. But the Sahajīās, instead of forcibly extinguishing the passion, try to so train it in the company of woman that it may not be affected by any cause however strong. With this end in view they speak of practising Rati in order to drive away the evil tendency from the mind. They hold that no love can grow so long as the mind is not steady. "If you do not practise Kāma, you cannot get the real thing." This is the philosophy of their secret practices.²

But how can this Kāma Rati be practised so as to make the mind ever-steady? In a manuscript which has recently been added to the collection of the Calcutta University,³ there is a detailed explanation of this process. Therein it is stated that the first concern of a worshipper is to select a beautiful girl of a certain description. He should then adorn her with ornaments and dresses, and begin the practice in the following manner. For the first three months he

¹ শরীর ভিতরে জান আছে কাল সর্প।

সেই সর্পে দিবানিশি করিছে দংশন ॥

কাম নিবারিতে নারে জীব নরাধম ॥—Amritaratnāvali

And

উপজে অন্তরে বিষ দেখিলে প্রকৃতি ।—Rasasāra, p. 46.

Also

কাম লোভ দুই রিপু হইবে প্রবল ।

এই দুই রিপু ধর্ম নাশিবে সকল ॥—Rasasāra, p. 44.

² প্রথম সাধন রতি সন্তোগ শৃঙ্গার ।

নাধিবে সন্তোগ রতি পালাবে বিকার ॥

জীবরতি দূরে যাবে করিলে সাধন ।

তারপর প্রেমরতি করি নিবেদন ॥—Amritaratnāvali.

নির্বিকার না হইলে নহে প্রমোদয় ।

কামরতি না সাধিলে না জানে বস্তুসার ॥—Amritaratnāvali.

সকলের সার হয় আপন সরিষ ।

নিজ দেহ জানিলে আপনে হবে হির ॥—Amritaratnāvali.

ভজনের মূল এই নরবপু দেহ ।—Amritaratnāvali.

আপনা জানিলে তবে সহজ বস্তু জানে ।—Ibid.

সকল শরীরে হয় অর্দ্ধাঙ্গ অবলা ।

পূরুষ প্রকৃতি দুই দেহ মধ্যে আছে ॥—Amritaratnāvali.

³ Manuscript No. 3437.

should lie at her feet without touching her. Then for three months more he should lie by her side in the same manner. For a further period of three months he should sleep in her arms and so forth, without falling a prey to temptations, however strong. By proceeding in this way a time will soon come when he will acquire perfect control over his passion and his mind will no longer hanker after gross enjoyment. This is the stage of equilibrium upon which the seed of love can grow in the mind.

The fourth theory is based upon the conception of human body, upon which, it is said, rests the theory of the Sahajīā practices. A Sahajīā should first of all know himself in order to understand his own religion. It is said that the body of a man is made up of the male and female halves. Men and women are different externally, but in the union of the soul they are one and without any difference. This idea, it is not difficult for a man to learn theoretically, but the question is how can the truth of this conception be realised by a man practically in his own body? The easiest means is to mix in the company of women in order to make the female nature easily understandable. The celebrated reformer Śankarāchārya followed the same course in order to qualify himself to answer a very delicate question put to him by a learned female scholar of his time. With the Sahajīās, however, it is a part of their religion, but if it could ever suit the pleasure of the proud men of refined taste to enquire after this truth, it could have solved many acute social problems of the day.

The fifth theory is more Tāntric in its nature. It aims at the rousing of the Madanamohana nerve¹ in the company of women which can then go upwards and reach an imaginary land called Sahajapur located on the head. The process is somewhat like the piercing of six lotuses practised by the Tāntriks.

Here we have five theories out of many supporting the practice of taking female companion for spiritual culture. Each of them has been treated separately in order to make the matter clear, but they are, nevertheless co-related.

•The first theory gives an idea of what a worshipper in the Sādhaka stage should do. At this stage he should try to love like a woman.

But what is love that he wishes to imitate in this way? He should know the thing before he can try to culture it. On this point, the second theory seems to say,—“ Love whomsoever you like, no matter if it be at first very gross in character, it may lead you to the highest perfection if you carefully culture it. Let love anyhow grow in your mind, this ought to be your first concern.” At the same time, the devotee should also try to make his mind as steady as possible. The third theory tells him how he should conduct himself in the company of women in order to acquire the power of bringing the evil passions under control. But a knowledge of the human body is also necessary for such physical culture. The fourth theory speaks about this matter, and is supplemented by the fifth theory which describes the Sahajīā goal and how it can be attained. The five theories are, therefore, linked together and aim at the attainment of the same object.

Though the Sahajīā doctrine thus advocates the company of women for spiritual culture yet it should be distinctly understood that women so required are not for gross enjoyment. They are simply required for self-realisation, and as soon as this is effected there is no necessity of women any more. Women are thus simply the means to an end. This idea is explained in a very nice way by two excellent similies. “ Beehives are filled up with honey collected from many flowers. When the honey is collected, the flowers are of no use.” “ In a dark room light is required to destroy darkness and to know the position of things it contains. As soon as this is done, the use of light can be dispensed with.”¹

The great writers of the Sahajīā doctrine often warn the worshipper against the sexual indulgence of any kind. It is said that real truth is never revealed to him who is given up to gross enjoyment.² A distinction is always made between the Rati of the

¹ মধু আনি মধু মাছি চাক করে যবে ।
নানান পুষ্পের মধু যোগ করি তবে ॥
বহু পুষ্প হৈতে মধু করে আরোপণ ।
সেই পুষ্প পুনঃ তার কোন্ প্রয়োজন ॥—Premabilāsa.
দীপহন্তে করি যদি প্রবেশয়ে যবে ।
তিমির করিয়া ধ্বংস দীপ্তিমান করে ॥
যেখানে যে দ্রব্য তাহা হয় বর্তমান ।
পঞ্চাৎ প্রদীপে আছে কোন প্রয়োজন ॥—Ibid.

² যদি বাক্য স্থখে সদা মজ মোর মন ।
তবেত না পাবে ভাই, সেই আনন্দ ধন ॥—Premānandaḥari,

body and the Rati of the mind. The Rati of the body, as is well-known, is manifested in physical union, which is denounced by the Sahajīā writers most¹ vehemently. It is said that by such gross enjoyment a man loses strength, descends to a lower level and so can never reach the goal.² The writer of the Vivartavilāsa quotes from the Chaitanya-charitāmṛita in support of this contention.³ Even Chandidās is said to have spoken to Rāmi that a worshipper can only reach the goal if he scrupulously avoids sensuality.⁴ And Vidyāpati is said to have written that a Sahajīā should take innumerable births in the pit of hell, if he engages his body for spiritual culture.⁵ Though Chandidās and Vidyāpati may not actually be the authors of these verses, yet they show how strongly the Sahajīās condemn immorality. The central idea is that Rāga or love cannot grow so long as the mind is not free from Kāma.⁶ The real doctrine of the Sahajīās is so puritanic in character. It has no place for sensuality of any kind.

It has been stated before that Rati is the foundation of the edifice of emotions and that other seven emotions are gradually traced to the evolution of this Rati. It is, therefore, important to know what do the Sahajīās mean by Rati. Rati in the Sahajīā theology has a higher significance. It is an abstract idea which is more theoretical than practical. It means love, pure and simple. A worshipper is advised to practise this Rati in the mind only. But what is meant by mental Rati? In Vedānta Sūtra we have an explanation of this idea. There we find,

শমনমাত্মপ্নেতঃ শাস্তথাগিতু তদ্বিধেস্তদন্তর।

তেষামবশ্রান্তচেষ্টয়াৎ । ৪-২-২৭

^১ ক্রীসঙ্গ করিলে নিজ আশ্বহারা হবে ।

আশ্বা নষ্ট হৈলে জীব অধোগতি পাবে ॥

^২ অসৎ সঙ্গ ত্যাগ এই বৈষ্ণব আচার ।

ক্রী সঙ্গ অসাধু এক, ক্লেশভক্ত আর ॥

^৩ তোমা আমা বেন রতি শূন্য হেন

এ মতি হইলে পাবে ।

^৪ নিজ দেহে যেবা ঘটায় সহজ

আচরিতে করে আশ ।

ভগ্নে বিদ্যাপতি (৭) কোটী ভদ্র তার

রৌরবেতে হবে বাস ॥

^৫ সদত কামের চেষ্টা চাতুরী কামের ।

জানিবারে পারে সে কি মাধুরী রাগের ॥

which¹ signifies that as a means of acquiring wisdom, one should practise *Sama*, *Dama*, etc. Now this *Samadamādi* means *Sama*, *Dama*, *Uparati*, *Titikṣā* and *Samādhāna*. *Uparati* means to refrain from actual practice in the act of acquiring wisdom. This is quite consistent with the meaning the *Sahajiās* attribute to *Rati*. *Rati* is to them not at all a physical union, but a term used to express a noble idea in a homely way. Even the most common term *Śrīngāra* is used to signify pure enjoyment of the mind.¹

The doctrines of the *Sahajiās* thus advocate a course of spiritual training for reaching beatitude by a steep ascent of self-control and other high qualities of the soul. It may have degenerated in certain quarters amongst the masses, but that is no fault of the principles that are promulgated by the leaders of the sect. As the religion of Buddha cannot be judged from the *Dharmapūjā* system of the *Domas*, so one cannot make an estimate of the real worth of the *Sahajiā* cult from the practices of the ignorant and the wicked.

IV. THE THEORY ABOUT HUMAN BODY.

The doctrine of the *Sahajiās* advocates the culture of the body as well as of mind, but it is to the former that they attach special importance. Human body is said to contain in itself all the elements requisite for spiritual culture and a thorough comprehension of one's² physical peculiarities is considered to be the source of all knowledge. A devotee should, therefore, first of all, acquire a clear conception of his own body, for upon this rests the graduated process of *Sahajiā* spiritual culture. But what is this knowledge of one's self that is held in such great importance by the *Sahajiās*? It comprises (i) a knowledge of creation to be conceived from a study of the relation between oneself and the *Paramātmā*, and (ii) a knowledge of the subtle physiology of the human body mostly represented in a mystic way after the manner of the *Tantras*, dealing principally with "Sarovaras" and "nerves" conceived after the "*Ṣaṭchakra*" theory of the *Tāntrics*.

¹ The phrase *বানলচিৎতরঙ্গঃ* of Śloka 42 of *Brahma Saṁhitā* is explained as *উজ্জ্বলার্থঃ শৃঙ্গারঃ*।

(i). THE THEORY OF CREATION.

The Supreme Soul, otherwise called Paramātmā, is the first cause of creation. The fourteen worlds emanated from Him. He is identified with Kṛiṣṇa, the Lord of Vaikuṇṭha. There He always enjoys pure joy undisturbed by sorrows of any kind. When he experiences the desire of creation, he looks towards Māyā from Vaikuṇṭha and enters into her womb in the form of a spark of fire and thus the mundane egg is produced. But this Māyā is herself the creation of the Supreme Soul. In the beginning there had been none but Paramātmā Himself. For the purpose of enjoyment (*i. e.* for procreation) He divided Himself into two halves, the first half being called Puruṣa, and the other Prakṛiti. Thus Supreme Prakṛiti is another name of Māyā. Now, from this Māyā begins creation at the wink of the Supreme Soul. So Māyā or Prakṛiti, as she is called, is the medium of creation of the Supreme Soul.¹

Now, this Paramātmā is born anew in the womb of Prakṛiti and becomes the human soul. So, human soul is nothing but the Paramātmā Himself, who thus rules over the human body. Yet this human soul holds an inferior position to Paramātmā. What the Puruṣa is to the Prakṛiti, Paramātmā is to the Jivātmā. But the human body contains another soul called Bhūtātmā, or the spirit ruling over the five elements composing the body. This Bhūtātmā is related to Jivātmā, as the latter is to Paramātmā. Bhūtātmā nourishes Jivātmā who in turn nourishes Paramātmā.²

Religious speculations of this sort are analogous to those propounded in many of the Hindu scriptures. For instance, in the

“চৌদ্ধভুবনের জগৎ পরমাত্মা হইতে হয়।”

“পরমপুরুষ কৃষ্ণ বৈকুণ্ঠের পতি।

ইচ্ছা হৈলে তিহো চান মায়ী প্রতি।

গোলোক বৈকুণ্ঠ হৈতে করেন ইক্ষণ।

ভেজরাপি পরমাত্মা অবশ্য তখন।”

“স্বপ্ন অশুভব হেতু দুইভাগ হৈল।

পুরুষ অকৃতি দুই পরমাত্মা হৈঞ।”

“অখান অকৃতি মায়ী তাহা আগে কহে।”

“দেহে আসি পরমাত্মা হৈল অবতীর্ণ।”

“পরমাত্মা পুরুষ জীবাত্মা অকৃতি।”

“জীবাত্মার দ্বারে পরমাত্মার সেবন।”

Mahānirvāṇa Tantra it is said that *Puruṣa* and everything else, originated from *Prakṛiti*, even the whole universe springs from her.¹ *Īśvara* himself enters into the universe as *Jīva*. This theory about *Prakṛiti* is evidently an echo of the well-known doctrine of the Hindu Philosophical Works.

The trace of this doctrine are also to be found in the Vedāntic theories of Rāmānuja, Ānandatīrtha, Vallabha and Chaitanya Deva. The system of Rāmānuja advocates that the individual soul is an attribute of the Supreme Soul. "The subtle form of the insensate world is *Prakṛiti*. It develops under the guidance of the indwelling Supreme Spirit until the mundane egg is produced."² *Īśvara* is pure joy or blessedness.

According to Ānandatīrtha God possesses the holy form made up of joy. Creation begins when the Supreme Soul disturbs the equilibrium of the *Prakṛiti*, until the mundane egg is produced.³

Vallabhāchāryya's theory advocates that the one primeval soul was not joyful, because he was alone, and desiring to be many he himself became the inanimate world and the individual soul which sprang from him like sparks from a burning fire.

With Chaitanya Deva, however, Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme God, the Creator of the whole universe. He is always joyful and sportive. He is the Lord of the power of illusion or *Māyā*. *Rādhā*, the *Prakṛiti* of Kṛṣṇa, is the manifestation of the faculty of joy embodied in Kṛṣṇa himself.⁴ His power of differentiation creates *Jīva* or individual soul. *Jīva* rests upon Kṛṣṇa for its existence and action.

Thus it is quite clear that the Sahajīās in determining the relation between *Jīvātmā*, *Paramātmā* and *Prakṛiti* have not invented a theory of their own, but have followed the earlier Vaiṣṇava apostles who in their turn culled their doctrines from the Hindu philosophical works. These theories are quite different from that advocated by Śaṅkarāchārya. With him God alone is true, the rest of the world is mere illusion. But the Vaiṣṇavas refute this theory most

¹ প্রকৃতি জগতে পুংসাং প্রকৃতি স্বভূতে জগৎ ।

etc., etc., মহানির্বাণ ।

² Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar's *Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism*.

³ "শ্রীরাধাহি কৃষ্ণ স্বরূপভূতা হলাদিনী শক্তিরেব ।"

উজ্জ্বল নীলমণি ।

vehemently. With them *Māyā* (Prakriti or ignorance) is the creative energy of God, who takes birth in everything earthly through the medium of this *Māyā*. So this world is not nothing, as *Śaṅkarāchārya* teaches us to believe, but a part of the Great God. This idea is the key-stone of the *Vaiṣṇava* spiritual culture. In man, as well as in everything else, the *Vaiṣṇavas* find an image of God, only temporarily blinded through ignorance or *Māyā*. When man destroys this *Māyā*, he becomes free and one with God. The whole process of *Vaiṣṇava* spiritual culture aims at the destruction of this *Māyā* or ignorance by gradual moral improvement until the final emancipation is attained. So, the knowledge of the relation of God and man is absolutely necessary for a *Vaiṣṇava* in order to understand his own doctrine. It is for this reason that the *Sahajīā* writers touch upon this point not unfrequently in their religious books.

Another important idea is the conception of *Puruṣa* and *Prakriti* in every human body. *Puruṣa* is located in the right side and *Prakriti* in the left. This is true both in the case of man and woman. However different they may be in external appearance, they possess the same soul within them.¹ The soul of a man does not materially differ from that of a woman in the slightest degree, for both of them are really the sparks of the same Supreme Soul. This is an important idea for the purpose of spiritual improvement. The mind of a man at once rests in peace when he gets at the truth of this conception. As soon as the idea that essentially there is no difference between man and woman is realised, sexual hankerings and the troubles that follow, are at rest for good. It also teaches that love should crave for the union of soul to soul which constitutes a natural union, and hence should not be identified with the craving of flesh and blood which belongs to the lower order of animal life.

There is another reason why special importance is attached to this idea. It creates in the mind a notion of equality and when a man thus knows himself equal to others, he rises to a stage of moral perfection, which is the aim of all spiritual culture.²

¹ "একরূপ দুই হয় ভিন্ন দেহ নয়।

প্রকৃতি পুরুষ নাম বাহিরে দেখায় ॥"

² "নিজ দেহ অস্ত্র দেহ এক জ্ঞান যার।

ঈর্ষা কর্ষা ভেদাত্মক কেন হবে তার ॥"

(ii) THE SUBTLE PHYSIOLOGY OF HUMAN BODY.

(a) *Sarovaras*.

The Sahajīā writers locate “Sarovaras” in different parts of the body. The term “Sarovaras” is ordinarily used to mean “pond” but here it means the receptacle of some subtle energy, just as in the Tantric mode of worship, the term “Nāḍī” ordinarily used for a nerve, means “subtle channel of energy.” The Sahajīās use these terms simply to express some philosophical truth in a more homely way. Let us now take the four principal Sarovaras, namely, Kāma, Prema, Māna and Akṣaya. Kāma and Prema are adjacent and situated in the middle part of the body, the former occupying a position to the left of the latter, while the Māna and Akṣaya are similarly situated on the head. Again, if a vertical line be drawn dividing the body into two parts, Kāma and Māna fall to the left half, while the other two to the right. Now, let us see what is meant by this arrangement. It has been stated before that Prakṛiti occupies the left half and Puruṣa the right half of everybody. So, Kāma and Māna fall to the Prakṛiti part of the body, while Prema and Akṣaya to the Puruṣa part.¹ Kāma and Māna are the two characteristic attributes of women, and hence these two ponds fall to the Prakṛiti part of the body. But there is a deeper significance underlying this conception. We know from the Chaitanya-Charitāmṛita that the difference between Kāma and Prema lies in the mode of action, the former assuming the character of the latter when the work is done without any selfish motive.² The Sahajīās also hold

১ কাম সরোবর আর মান সরোবর ।
বাম পাশে অকৃতি অঙ্গ মন মনোহর ।
অক্ষয় সরোবর আর প্রেম সরোবর ।
দক্ষিণ পাশে পুরুষ অঙ্গ শরীর ভিতর ॥

২ “আম্বল্লিয়ার ঐতি ইচ্ছা তার নাম কাম ।
কৃষ্ণল্লিয়ার ঐতি ইচ্ছা তার প্রেম নাম ।”
“কাম প্রেম সাধনের একই করণ ।”
“কাম পুনঃ প্রেম হয় বস্তুভজ্ঞানে ॥”
“তত্ত্বজ্ঞানে সাধু সঙ্গে প্রেমভক্তি ধার ।
কাম সরোবর পুনঃ প্রেম নাম তার ॥”

the same view and hence they place Kāma and Prema ponds side by side.

Again, for spiritual elevation, it is necessary that Kāma (desire) and Māna (pride) should be given up. This can be done by careful training of the body and hence two ponds bearing those names are located in it. But of the four ponds, the most important is the Akṣaya pond wherein lives Paramātmā or Supreme Soul. This Akṣaya pond corresponds to the Sahasrāra lotus of the Tantras. It is named Akṣaya, because Paramātmā, who lives in it, is without beginning and end.¹ We also know that Paramātmā divided himself into Puruṣa and Prakṛiti—the latter occupying the left side. Hence Māna pond is placed on the left side of the Akṣaya pond on the head.

Now, the process of physical culture is this. Avoid Kāma and Māna, and take to Prema ; this will lead to spiritual emancipation.

Other ponds are also metaphorically located in different parts of the body. Śravaṇa pond is the ear, Kṣīra pond is the eye and Amṛita pond is mouth. So, also there are Kanṭha pond, Prithu pond and Ghora pond. But these ponds are of minor importance and present no difficulty to grasp at the inner meaning. It is said that the idea of ponds can be better understood by a devotee when he gains consciousness through spiritual culture, just as the existence of lotuses can be better understood by a successful Tantric worshipper.

(b) *Nāḍīs.*

It is said in the Tantras that there are 8½ crores of nerves in human body, of which fourteen are chief. Among these Iḍā, Piṅgalā and Sushumnā are most important. The names of the principal nerves are :—Iḍā, Piṅgalā, Sushumnā, Vajrā, Chitrinī, Brahma, Kuṭṭī, Śankhinī, Gāndhārī, Hastijibhika, Saraswatī, Puṣā, Payasvinī, Bārūni, Alambhusā, Viśvodari, Sahasvinī and Nidrā.

¹ “সমুদ্রেতে পরমাত্মা সহস্র দলেতে ।
অকর সরোবর বলি কহিলো তাহাতে ॥
পরমাত্মার কর সাই তাহাতে অকর ।”
“সমুদ্র দক্ষিণ ভাগে অকর সরোবর ।
বামদিকে হয় তার মান সরোবর ॥
দক্ষিণে পুরুষ দেহ বামেতে প্রকৃতি ।
সুই সরোবর ইথে কহিল নিশ্চিতি ॥”

The Sahajīās conceive as many as 32 nerves in the human body. The names of these nerves are as follows :—Idā, Pingalā, Sushumṇā, Shuṇya, Dvīpta, Kiron, Dhira, Nāvi, Hingulā, Rati, Tāmra, Kānti, Ujjvala, Kambu, Śrabaṇa, Darsana, Bāk, Bhāndāra, Lakṣavān, Dagdhahema, Sārāsāra, Subasu, Subhadra, Nīschida, Chandrahāyi, Kṣīrodakaśāyi, Garbhodakaśāyi, Arunabarṇā, and four other nerves.

It will be seen from above that the Sahajīās have adopted the three principal nerves of the Tantras, but in the nomenclature of the rest, they are somewhat free. It cannot be denied that they are indebted to the Tantras for the conception of various nerves.

PARAKIYĀ.

The idea of Parakiyā is ingrained in the Sahajīā doctrine. It may properly be called the very pivot upon which the whole fabric of the mystic practices of the Sahajīās entirely rests. For this reason, the terms Sahajīā and Parakiyā, in the common acceptance of the terms, are used almost in an identical sense. Parakiyā, however, literally means “pertaining or belonging to another,” but the Sahajīās, in connection with their spiritual culture, use it in the special sense of performing religious practices in the company of woman other than one’s wedded wife. In Poetics, Parakiyā has been defined, so far as the weaker sex is concerned, as “the woman who, disregarding merits either in this world or in the next, gives herself up for ‘love to a person with whom she has not been legally married.’”¹ In the same way, a person is said to have adopted Parakiyā who, without caring for the time-honoured custom, loves a woman with whom he has not been married, and whose love is the only object of his anxious solicitude.² Moreover, Parakiyā is often used in contrast to Svakiyā which, when applied to a woman, means a legally married wife who

¹ রাগেনৈবার্পিতান্নানো লোক যুগ্মাহুপেক্ষিণা ।

ধৰ্ম্মে না স্বীকৃত্য যান্ত পরকীয়া ভবতিতাঃ ।

উজ্জল নীলমণি—কৃষ্ণবল্লভা—৩

² রাগে নোন্নত্বয়ং ধৰ্ম্মং পরকীয়া বলাৰ্হিণী ।

ভদীর প্রেম সৰ্ব্বব্যো বৃধৈরূপপতি স্বতঃ ॥

উজ্জল নীলমণি—নাটক ভেদ—১১

is always ready to carry out the wishes of her husband, for whom she cherishes unqualified love.¹ From the above, it is quite clear that love is the qualifying factor in the Parakiyā union, without which it degenerates into gross sensuality. On the other hand, mere marriage does not imprint on a woman the character of Svakiyā unless she has absolute resignation in her husband. Love is, therefore, the watch-word, either with a Svakiyā or a Parakiyā couple, but in actual practice this high ideal is not unfrequently ignored by them. As for the Sahajiās, they generally take Parakiyā in the ordinary sense of union with men and women who are not united by the bond of marriage. They have each one or more Prakritis or Manjaris as they are often termed, *i.e.*, women who live together bound by a sort of temporary contract which has neither the compulsion, nor the absolute dependence of married life. Besides, many families of these people sometimes live together in close companionship very favourable for indulging in immorality, for they have the sanction of their Śāstras removing all sorts of orthodox prejudices in the matter of sexual purity. In such a community, as can be easily understood, the ideal of the culture of the tender emotion of love enjoined by the Sahajiā doctrine is very often liable to be forgotten. Besides, the Sahajiā doctrine gets its largest recruits from amongst people occupying inferior ranks in society who are generally drawn towards it by the attraction of free social intercourse, and who are consequently not very scrupulous about the pleasure of the senses. We are also in possession of facts that the converts from the degraded Buddhists, and the outcasts of other societies, also swell the rank of the Sahajiās. In this hotch-potch of heterogeneous elements, the ideal of Parakiyā has lost its original significance, and it is now used in the degraded sense of union with men and women, not necessarily for religious practices, but even for the common household purpose and improper gratification.

The ideal of Parakiyā is at least as old as the Vedas
 Parakiyā is as old as the Vedas. and the Upanisads, and there are unquestionable
 proofs of its existence in the Buddhist
 community even before the Christian era. But the doctrine of

¹ কন্যার বিধিঃ আশ্রমঃ পত্ন্যারদেশ তৎপরাঃ।

পাতিব্রত্যাধিবেশাঃ স্বকীয়া কথিতা ইহ ॥

উদ্ধলনীলমণি—কৃষ্ণবরতা—৩

the Tantras is primarily based upon the Parakiyā theory. The Atharva Veda Samhitā clearly mentions something like the Parakiyā union which it not only supports with its own authority, but even holds out as a means of enjoying a united existence in the after-life. "The woman, who, possessing a husband, accepts another husband, may avoid separation from the latter by performing the ceremony of Aja Panchadona ; and if the second husband does the same, they can together go to the same abode after death.¹ This not only legalises union with a Parakiyā wife, but speaks of certain religious practices that can be performed by the new couple to secure a place in heaven. In the Chhāndogya Upaniṣad, there is a mantra which deals with the act of generation, the substance of which is simply this—"Let one realise the glory of the five-fold Lord called Vāmadevya Sāmāna in the act of generation." In this verse there is a phrase "ন কাংচন পরিহরেৎ" which has been interpreted by the renowned Śāṅkarāchārya as follows—"He who knows this Vāmadevya Sāmāna, has no binding as regards the law of sexual intercourse, his vow is 'let no woman be abandoned.'" ² This shows that in the worship of the God Vāmadevya Sāmāna, the devotee could take Parakiyā wives, even more than one, as is advocated by the Sahajīās. The law of marriage in that prehistoric age was not so strict as it is now, as can be guessed from the following assertion of the Atharvaveda Samhitā—"If a woman, after having ten non-Brahmin husbands, is again married by a Brahmin, then that Brahmin is the real husband of the woman." ³ The necessity of this regulation shows that Parakiyā must have been not only in vogue in that remote past, in the Hindu Society even among the higher castes, but received the sanction of the respective Śāstras of the various creeds.

The Kathā-Vathu, a Buddhist book, written before the Christian era, mentions a custom called "Ekādhippayo" Parakiyā in Buddhism. that was prevalent amongst the Andhras, Vetalyakas, and the Uttara Pathakas. It says, "Sexual relation

¹ যা পূৰ্ব্বং পতিং বিধাত্তং বিম্ভতেহ পরম্।

পক্ষৌদনং চ তাবজং দদাতো ন বি যোষতঃ ॥

সমানলোকো ভবতি পুনৰ্ বাপরঃ পতিঃ ।

জোহজং পক্ষৌদনং দক্ষিণা জ্যোষিতং দদতি ॥ 9.5-27.28.

² Quoted from the Allahabad Edition of the Chhāndogya Upaniṣad.

³ উত যত্ পতরো দশস্ত্রিয়াং পূৰ্ব্বে অত্রাঙ্গণাঃ ।

ব্রহ্মা চেদ্ হন্তঃ অগ্রহীত্ স এষ পতিরেকধা ॥ 5.17-8

may be entered upon with a united resolve. Such a vow may be undertaken by a human pair who feel mutual sympathy or compassion* (not passion merely) and who worship at the same Buddha shrine, and aspire to be united throughout their future lives.”¹ The Buddhist Sahajīā doctrine also advocates the enjoyment of the pleasure of the senses. “Do not torture your body by means of austere practices, instead of enjoying the pleasure of the five senses. Covet wisdom by following the path of enjoyment according to the dictates of sacred books.”² “Enjoy the pleasure of the senses by always keeping your mind unperturbed by joy or grief.”³ Such preachings are not rare in the Buddhist Sahajīā books.

But by far the strongest advocates of Parakiyā doctrine are the Hindu Tantras. The Birāchāra mode of worship of the Tāntrics is entirely based upon association with Parakiyā woman. Passages, like the following, are very often met with in the Tāntric books⁴ :—

“No worship is valid without fish, meat, Mudrā and co-habitation.”

“A devotee should think in his mind that he is enjoying either with a Svakiyā or a Parakiyā woman.”

“If a devotee worships without taking a Parakiyā companion, he will not be able to attain success even by reciting the Mantras hundred crores of time.”

“There is no doubt that woman is the goal, woman is the life, and woman is the salvation of a devotee. The contemplation of women means nothing but the contemplation of the Goddess Kālī.”

These are, undoubtedly, bold assertions, the like of which can rarely be found in any other Śāstras.

¹ Points of controversy.—pp. 365-366.

² পঞ্চ কামান্ পরিত্যজ্য তপোভিনৈব গীড়য়েৎ ।

হুত্বেন সাধয়েদ্বোধিং যোগতন্ত্রানু সারতঃ ॥ শ্রীসমাজ

³ দুখং হুবে” একু করিআ ভুঞ্জই ইন্দিজানী ।

দারিক পাদ ।

⁴ “বিনা শক্তি ন পূজান্তি মন্ত্ৰমাংসং বিনা ত্রিয়ে ।

মুদ্রাক মৈথুনঞ্চাপি বিনা নৈব প্রপূজয়েৎ ॥”

স্বকীয়ং পরকীয়ং বা মানসত্বে রমেৎ ত্রিয়ং”

• “বিনা পরকীয়া দেবি জপেৎ যদি তু সাধকঃ ।

শত কোটী জপেনৈব তন্ত্র সিদ্ধির্ন জায়তে ॥

ত্রিভো গতি ত্রিভো প্রাণাঃ ত্রিঃ সিদ্ধির্ন সংশয়ঃ ।

নারীনাং স্মরণে কালী স্মারিতা সান সংশয়ঃ ॥”

Parakiyā has two aspects, (i) the Parakiyā as a symbol and (ii) the Parakiyā as a means of training the senses. The former is advocated by the followers of Chaitanya Deva, who are known as Gaudīya Vaiṣṇavas, while the latter by the Sahajīās, who, though they call themselves a sect of the Vaiṣṇavas, are hated by them for their practising Parakiyā in the company of the living women of flesh and blood. The Gaudīya Vaiṣṇavas advocate Parakiyā merely as a symbol of divine love, but the Sahajīās adopt Parakiyā woman for performing secret rites for the purpose of emancipation. But whatever it may be, it is true beyond doubt that the whole Vaiṣṇava community of Bengal, is permeated by the idea of the Parakiyā with this difference that the Vaiṣṇavas attribute higher spiritual significance to the Parakiyā ideal, while the Sahajīās take it in the ordinary sense of union with men and women who are not united by the bond of marriage. The difference between these two sects are as wide as the poles, as the following discussion will clearly establish :—

The idea of Parakiyā crept into the Vaiṣṇava theology on account of the legends of the love amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. The popular belief is that Rādhā, who was the wife of a person, milk-man by caste, fell in love with Kṛṣṇa who was the incarnation of Viṣṇu in the form of a cowherd. The Bengali Vaiṣṇavas are the worshippers of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa and hence they can hardly dispense with the idea of Parakiyā manifested in the love of these two deities. But they take it in this sense that God is to be loved with as much intensity and fervour as Rādhā loved Kṛṣṇa, sacrificing everything else for the object of her love. Thus the legend of Rādhā teaches the Vaiṣṇavas entire resignation in divine love, and this is the true spirit which inspired all the Vaiṣṇava poets of Bengal to write their beautiful love lyrics. Their main theme is the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa when they were in their Kaiśora. It is the period of life in which the child steps into the first youth. It is the dawn of youth called the Bayasandhi by the Vaiṣṇava poets and rhetoricians. This is a period in which the world presents its romance in every object of sight, when men and women easily run into the highest sacrifices for the sake of love, and one performs self-less acts without a thought of return. Childhood is a period of ignorance, and youth intensifies the passions. But between childhood and youth is the ever-green Kaiśora the most delightful

Origin of Parakiyā
in Vaiṣṇavism.

time in the life of a man when everything wears the aspect of a romance in his eyes, and pure love takes possession of the soul. •

In order to show that the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa was entirely pure, the Vaiṣṇava writers only deal with the Kaiśora-love of the pair. In Parakiyā is merely a symbol of divine love. • Bhaktirasāmṛita Sindhu, Rup Goswāmi says,—“Kaiśora is the best time when pure love grows in the mind.”¹ Chandidās invariably places Rādhā in that period of life which is intermediate between childhood and youth.² Even Mukundadeva Goswāmi, who is an important Sahajīā writer, has adopted the love of Kaiśora as the type of the most perfect love that exists in heaven.³ The celebrated Govinda Dās in his Kaṭachā says—“Pray to God with such love as is experienced by a young woman when she sees a beautiful young man.”⁴ This proves conclusively that with the Vaiṣṇavas the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa is merely a symbol to express in a homely way the sort of love that a man should feel for God. The legend is not for them a precedent to indulge in Parakiyā love for gross enjoyment, but merely a symbol to indicate the love of a devotee for the God he worships. It soars high and communes with God. It is purely a mental phenomenon from the scope of which the physical element of man is entirely discarded. The Bhaktirasāmṛita Sindhu says—“The love of the Gopis is spoken of as Kāma.”⁵ In the Chaitanya Charitāmṛita, Kṛṣṇa Dās Kavirāj Goswāmi writes,—“The natural love of the Gopis should not be mistaken for carnal desire, though it is generally called Kāma for the sake of an apt simile.”⁶ He further writes—“He, who feels a longing for adopting the nectar-like love of the Gopis, worships Kṛṣṇa by leaving off the dictates of all the Śāstras. So, you must imitate the love of the Gopis, and think about the love amours of

¹ শ্রেষ্ঠমুচ্ছল মেবাস্ত কৈশোরস্ত তথাপাদঃ ।

² Sahitya Pariṣad Edition of the Lyrics of Chandidās, pp. 3, 8, 30, etc., etc.

³ তাহার ভিতর কিশোরী কিশোর না হয় গোচর কার ।

⁴ স্থলর নায়ক দেখি সামান্ত নায়িকা ।

⁵ যেই ভাবে দেখে তারে হয়ে রাগজ্বিকা ।

⁶ সেই ভাবে কৃষ্ণকে ডাকহ বার বার ।

⁷ প্রেমের গোপ রামানন্ড কাম ইত্যগমং প্রণামিত্তি ।

⁸ সহজে গোপীর প্রেম নহে প্রাকৃত কাম ।

কামক্রিয়া সামো তারে কহে কাম নাম ।

Rādhā and Kṛiṣṇa day and 'night.'¹ In the *Rasasāra Grantha*, we also find an echo of the same sentiment—"Those who worship with love like the Gopis have no charm for following 'the dictates of the Śāstras.'"² Thus it is perfectly clear that the legend of Rādhā and Kṛiṣṇa only teaches a devotee the sort of love that he should harbour in his mind for spiritual emancipation.

This love, the Vaiṣṇavas maintain, was practically manifested by Chaitanya Deva. His frequent love trances, wailings for union with God, and the laments of separation are said to be the external manifestations of his internal divine love. So great was this emotion in him that he often forgot himself at the sight of a blue cloud, a Tamāla tree, and the river Jamunā, associated with the legend of Kṛiṣṇa. This led the devout Vaiṣṇavas to believe that Chaitanya Deva was born with the soul of Rādhā. Kṛiṣṇa Dās Kavirāj Goswāmi, in his celebrated Chaitanya Charitāmrita, speaks about the incarnation of Chaitanya Deva thus—"Kṛiṣṇa took birth in the womb of Śachi with the emotions of Rādhā in order to see for himself how deeply he was loved by her, what charming fascination his beauty possesses which made Rādhā mad after love, and lastly, to taste the pleasure that Rādhā had experienced when united with him."³ Even the Sahajīā writers do not disagree with this view in theory. Rāgamayakaṇā says,— "Nārāyaṇa was born in the womb of Sachi with the body and emotions of Rādhā as his ornament."⁴ *Rasasāra Grantha* says—"Kṛiṣṇa was born in this world in the form of Chaitanya Deva in order to taste the love and emotions of Rādhā."⁵

- ¹ দেই গোপীভাবামতে বার লোভ হয় ।
বেদধর্ম সর্বভেজি দেই কৃষ্ণের ভজয় ॥
অতএব গোপীভাব করি অঙ্গিকার ।
রাজিদিনে চিন্ত রাধা কৃষ্ণের বিহার ॥
- ² গোপীকার ভাবে ভজে যেই ভক্তগণ ।
তারে গ্রাঞী রূঢ়ে বেদ সান্তের কথন ॥
- ³ শ্রীরাধায়াঃ প্রণয় মহিমা কীদৃশো বানয়েবা—
স্বাচ্ছো যেনাক্তত মধুরিমা কীদৃশো বা মদীয়ঃ ।
সৌখ্য চাস্তা মদহুভবতঃ কীদৃশং বেতি লোভা—
ভক্তাবাচাঃ সমজনি শচী গর্ত্তং দিকৌ হরীন্দুঃ ॥
- ⁴ জন্মে নারায়ণ শচী গর্ত্তেতে আসিয়া ।
ভাব কাস্তি রাধিকার ভূষণ করিয়া ॥
- ⁵ অবতরি ভূমণ্ডলে চৈতন্য রূপেতে ।
শ্রীরাধিকা ভাব কাস্তি প্রেম আধারিতে ॥

In the Amritarasāvali we find—"As Kṛiṣṇa never felt in his mind the impulses of transcendental love, so he took birth in the womb of Śachi."¹ This is the interpretation which the Vaiṣṇavas universally put upon the incarnation of Chaitanya Deva. The Parakiyā love of Rādhā has thus been utilised to set forth a noble ideal of divine love which was practically demonstrated by Chaitanya Deva in his own life for the benefit of the people.

Even the six Goswāmīs and the other distinguished followers of Chaitanya Deva are each said to be the incarnation of a Gopi.² In this connection it is worth mentioning that the Vaiṣṇavas consider Rādhā to be the personification of all the noble sentiments, while each Gopi is said to represent a particular emotion.³ When both Rādhā and Kṛiṣṇa are said to be united in Chaitanya Deva, it is quite natural that his followers should be identified with the Gopis. But what is meant by such assertions is not difficult to understand. We have already noted that the intense hankering of Chaitanya Deva for union with God, made the Vaiṣṇavas ascribe to him the sentiments of Rādhā. In the same way, the followers of Chaitanya Deva were each personified with a Gopi on account of the particular mode of worship that he followed under the impulse of a particular emotion. Thus Rup Goswāmi is identified with Rup Manjari, Raghunāth with Rasa Manjari, Jiva Goswāmi with Vilāsa Manjari, and so forth. Puri is said to have adopted the sentiment of Vātsalya, Rāmānanda Roy Sakhya, Govinda Dās and others the Dāsyā Rasa.

This is the conception of the Vaiṣṇavas about Rādhā, Kṛiṣṇa, Chaitanya and his followers. They never interpret the love amours of Rādhā and Kṛiṣṇa in the light of gross sensuality. They advance philosophical arguments to remove even the stain of Parakiyā from the transcendental love of Rādhā in order to justify the purity of their faith. Rup Goswāmi,

Parakiyā defended.

¹ অকৈতব প্রেম বস্তু নহে আবাদন ।

এই লাগি শরী গর্ভে লভিল জনম ।

² নানাছানে আছে অত সখাসখীগণ ।

পুনঃ সবে আসি প্রভুর সহিত মিলন ।

³ প্রেমের প্রথম সার মহাভাব জানি ।

সেই মহাভাব রূপা রাধা ঠাকুরাণী ।

ভাবের লহরী যত ললিতা বিসম্বা ।

সত্য কহি ভাবশূর্য্যময়ী শ্রীরাধিকা ।

who was the most favourite disciple of Chaitanya Deva, and who is credited with the authorship of numerous theological works which are even now regarded as undisputed authorities about the modern Vaiṣṇava faith of Bengal, wrote in his celebrated Kaṭachā—“Rādhā represents the element of joy (among Sat, Chit and Ānanda) that is embodied in Kṛṣṇa himself. Though they are thus one in soul yet formerly (*i.e.* in the person of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā) they manifested themselves in separate bodies (but in the Kali Age, they were united in the person of Chaitanya Deva).”¹ This is the very foundation upon which rests the modern Vaiṣṇavism of Bengal which originated with Chaitanya Deva. The belief of the unity of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa is far too deep in the Vaiṣṇava mind to be removed by the force of any plausible argument, however powerful it may be. It is thus quite clear that the Vaiṣṇavas cannot admit Parakiyā element in the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. In the Ujjvalaṇiḥaṇi there is an argument which clearly establishes this proposition. “As Rādhā is the most perfect image of the faculty of joy which (with Sat and Chit) is a constituent element of Kṛṣṇa, so an union with her can never be a Parakiyā union (so far as Kṛṣṇa is concerned).”² Kṛṣṇa Dās Kavirāj has adopted the same view for the purpose of explaining away the questionable character of the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.—“Rādhā is the vitiation of the constituent humour of joy in the person of Kṛṣṇa himself, and hence she is called the Lhādini faculty of God. They are separate in external appearance but possess the same soul between them.”³ Even the Sahajīa writers have exactly copied from these authorities. So, in the Rāgamayakaṇā we have—“Rādhā is the incarnation of joy that is in Kṛṣṇa.”⁴ In Premānanda Lahari—“According to Śāstras, both of them have one mind, though they are separate in bodies. Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa form an

রাধা কৃষ্ণপ্রণয় বিকৃতি হলাদিনী শক্তিরস্মি—
দেকাআনাবপি ভুবি পুরা দেহ ভেদঃ গতো তৌ ।

etc., etc.

শ্রীরাধাহি কৃষ্ণস্ত স্বরূপভূতাহাদিনী শক্তিরেব,
তস্তাঃ বল্লভঃ স্বীয়াত্মেব নতু পরকীরাত্ম ঘটতে ।

Notes on Sloka 16, Chapter I.

¹ রাধিকা হইলেন কৃষ্ণের প্রণয় বিকার ।

স্বরূপ শক্তি হলাদিনী নাম স্বীকার ॥

রাধা কৃষ্ণ এক আত্মা দুই দেহ ধরি ।

² আত্মাদিনী রূপিণী রাধিকা আনন্দাংশে ।

undivided unity.”¹ The writer of the Rasa Sāra Grantha puts forth the argument thus—“As the limbs are to the body, so is Rādhā to Kṛṣṇa”² proving thereby that Rādhā is a part of Kṛṣṇa himself, and, therefore, the stain of Parakiyā can never disfigure their love which is beyond reproach of any kind. Though for the sake of argument it is admitted that Rādhā and the Gopis were not the married wives of Kṛṣṇa, yet their union with him had nothing of the Parakiyā character in it, even from a consideration of the sense in which the term Parakiyā is used in society. Eminent Vaiṣṇava writers have dealt with this point also. In the Bhāgavata we have—“Though the Gopis went to Kṛṣṇa, yet their husbands bore no spite against him, for they always felt the presence of their wives near them,—so overwhelmed were they by the miraculous power of Kṛṣṇa.”³

In the Ujjvalanilamani Rupa Goswāmi writes—“Gopis were no doubt married to other persons, but they had no co-habitation with their husbands. When they would go to the tryst to meet Kṛṣṇa their husbands thought that their wives were in their home, for they could always see the forms of Gopis created by illusion there.”⁴ The same book further states—“The Gopis were accepted by Kṛṣṇa according to the Gandharva mode (custom of free love) of marriage. So, they were Svakiyās but not Parakiyās.”⁵

In the Chaitanya Charitāmṛita, Kṛṣṇa Dās Kavirāj puts forth in the mouth of Kṛṣṇa—“That our union is a Parakiyā one is not known either to the Gopis or to me.”⁶

The Padma Purāṇa supports the union thus—“The women who are accepted according to the prevalent custom are called Svakiyās. Though the Gopis were not so accepted by Kṛṣṇa, yet they

¹ দেহের সে এক মন ভিন্ন নাহি হয়।

দুইরূপ এক আত্মা শাস্ত্রে নিরূপয়।

যথা রাধা তথা কৃষ্ণ অপূর্ণ মুরতি ॥

² নিজস্ব সঙ্গ এনে ভিন্ন অঙ্গ নয়।

আনুসঙ্গি তত্ত্বাঙ্গি ভিন্ন নাহি কয় ॥

³ নাস্ময়ন্ পলু কদায় মোহিতান্তত মায়য়।

মন্তব্যনাঃ স্বপাংস্থান্ স্থান্ স্থান্ দারান্ ব্রজীকয়ঃ ॥—10.33.37

⁴ মায়াকল্পিততাদৃক-জ্ঞানীনেনানুস্থিতিঃ । ১৯

ন জ্ঞাতু ব্রজদেবীনাং পতিভিঃ সহ সঙ্গমঃ ॥ কৃষ্ণবল্লভা—১৯-২০

⁵ গান্ধর্বরীত্যা স্বীকারাৎ স্বীয়াৎমিহ বস্তুতঃ । কৃষ্ণবল্লভা—৫

⁶ আমিহ না জানি তাহা না জানে গোপীগণ।

are Śvakīyās, for they loved him with the sentiment of married wives.”¹

In the Bhāgavata it is distinctly pointed out that Kṛiṣṇa sported with the Gopis for the whole night during the Rāsa festival without any loss of energy.²

In these ways, the Vaiṣṇavas defend the union of Rādhā, Kṛiṣṇa and the Gopis, extricating them from the guilt of Parakīyā. It is not difficult to understand from the foregoing discussions that the Vaiṣṇavas also considered Parakīyā a questionable union, otherwise they would not have so laboriously dealt with this matter. That Parakīyā is a bad ideal cannot be denied, and when it is admitted as a principle in religion, there is no limit of the harm it can do. The Vaiṣṇavas were quite cognisant of this danger, and so they tried to nullify the evil effect of Parakīyā as best as they could. When Kṛiṣṇa Dās wrote in the Charitāmṛita that Parakīyā love is the best source of enjoyment, he immediately came down in the same verse to limit its sphere by saying—“ But it is confined only to Vraja.”³ He had no idea at that time that the Sahajīās would work upon this hint and localise Vraja in the human body which they will then employ for the practice of Parakīyā in the name of religion. It has already been pointed out that the Vaiṣṇavas adopted the Parakīyā love of Rādhā merely as a symbol of divine love. They then put forth all sort of injunctions against the misinterpretation of this idea, in order to guard against corruptions that they thought would otherwise ensue. Bidyāpati is said to have said—“ He, who employs his body for the practice of the Sahajīā doctrine, will live for thousand years in hell.”⁴ Chandidās says in his Rāgātīkā Padas—“ If you

¹ স্বীয়া জাতীয় ভাবেন নিপীলা এব ভাবিতাঃ ।

যাশ গোবলকম্বাহ পতিভাবরতঃ হরৌ

তাসাং তদ্বৃতি নিগূহানস্বীয়াইম সাস্পত্তং ॥

² এবং শশাঙ্কান্ডবিরাজিতা নিশাঃস সত্যকামেহমুরতাবলগণঃ

সিষেব আশ্রয়বন্ধুদৌরতঃ সর্বাঃ শরৎকাবা কথারদাশ্রয়াঃ ॥—10-33-25.

³ পরকীয়া ভাবে অতি রসের উল্লাস ।

ব্রজ বিনা প্রিয়ার অশ্রু নাহি বাস ॥

⁴ নিজ দেহ ঘেবা ঘটার সহজ

আচরিতে করে আশ ।

ভবে বিজ্ঞাপতি (৭) কোটা জন্ম তার

রোরবেতে হবে বাস ॥

deviate from the right path, you will not get the real thing, but will go to hell.”¹ He also asserts that in the Parakiyā mode of worship, the devotee should make his body dry like a piece of wood.”²

Thus, it is evident that the Gaudiya Vaiṣṇavas only advocated Parakiyā merely as a symbol, but not for the gratification of lust. The Sahajīās, on the other hand, adopted both the ideals, with special leaning towards the culture of the physical senses. The Sahajīā writers are very enthusiastic in delineating the doctrine of physical culture, holding that the culture of the body is not of less importance than the culture of the mind. The Vivartavilās, in dealing with the subject, begins thus—“O my mind! now hear about the external (physical) Parakiyā.”³ In the introduction to the Amritarasāvali, the writer acknowledges the culture of the body as a branch of the Sahajīā culture—“I bow down to Mukunda Deb Goswāmi who drove away my ignorance. He caused me to write about the Sahajīā doctrine under two heads—(i) the culture of the body, and (ii) the culture of the mind.”⁴ The writer of Ratnasāra also adopts the same classification—“Spiritual culture cannot be undertaken successfully if the mind be not pure; but how can the body be purified?”⁵ Great importance is also attached to the culture of the body. It is said that this body of ours is the very foundation of spiritual culture.” The Amritaratnāvali says—“You can rest in peace if you know your body.”⁷ It is interesting to note that the culture of the body is even identified with the Sahajīā doctrine. “Because there are five elements in the body, so it is said that the Sahajīā doctrine is

¹ বাস্তবচারী হৈলে অাপ্তি নাই মিলে
নরকে বাইবে তবে ।

² শুষ্ক কাঠের সম আপনার
দেহ করিতে হয় ।

³ বাহ্য পরকীর্য্য এবং শুন শুধে মন ।

⁴ বন্দ পোসাণী মুকুন্দ সাহা হৈতে গেল ধ্বংস
ছুই বস্তু যেরূপ প্রকাশিল ।

বাহ্যের সাধন মনের করন
সহজ বস্তু যেরূপ লিখাইল ॥

⁵ মনস্থ না হইলে সাধন না হয় ।
আপনার বাহ্য সাধু কেমনে করয় ॥

⁶ ভক্তনের মূল এই নরবপু দেহ ।

⁷ নিচ দেহ জানিলে আপনে হবে স্থির ।

nothing but the culture of our physical nature.”¹ In the *Rasaratna-sāra*, we have the same idea expressed in unequivocal terms—“The *Sāstras* say that he is a great *Yogi*, who has a clear insight into the true nature of the body; so, one must have a knowledge of it.”²

It is thus quite clear that the *Sahajīās* centred their attention to the culture of the human body. The real aim of such culture was to acquire a perfect control over the passions so as to check the evil tendencies which so often lead people astray. By the phrase “knowledge of the body” is meant a knowledge about our physical nature—about its tendencies, strength, weakness and so forth. But the *Sahajīās* came down from the plane of abstract philosophy to that of gross materialism. For the purpose of spiritual speculation, they gave a peculiar exposition of the various parts of the human body by locating in it nine joints, nine outlets, eight lotuses meaning thereby hands, feet, ear, nose, etc., many nerves, thirty-two rooms and so forth.³ They also indulged in many peculiar theories of their own in this respect. The body is said to have four directions, east, west, north and south, each guarded by a deer; and there are four, according to some eight, *sarovaras* in it.⁴ Some *Sahajīā* writers have also adopted the nerves and lotus theory of the *Tantras*. Thus they have stuffed the body with both manufactured and borrowed feathers in a nice way.

They have even gone still further. For the purpose of practising *Parakiyā* in the body, the *Sahajīās* declare that the body itself is a *Brindāvana*. This seems to be the wilful perversion of the assertion

¹ পঞ্চভূত পঞ্চজন দেহ ইথে হয় ।

দেহের সাধন সহজ এই হেতু কয় ॥

² আপন শরীর তত্ত্ব জানে যেই জন ।

সেইত পরম যোগী শাস্ত্রের বচন ॥

অন্তএব দেহতত্ত্ব অবগত জ্ঞাতব্য ।

³ “দেহ মধ্যে নবদ্বার নবমন্দির হয় ।”

“নবনাড়ি বত্রিশ কোটা শরীর ভিতরে ।”

“দেহ মধ্যে চারিদিক মুগী বাটোয়াল ।”

হস্ত পদ দুই হয় দুই পদ্য চরণ ।

চক্ষু পদ্য দুই ষষ্ঠ এই নিকূপণ ॥”

⁴ কাম সরোবর আর মান সরোবর ।

প্রেম সরোবর আর অক্ষয় সরোবর ॥

চারি সরোবর আছে হৃদয় ভিতরে ।

আপনার দেহ যদি পার সবিবারে

of Kṛiṣṇa Dās Kavirāj that Parakiyā is confined to Vraja alone. When the body is thus identified with Vraja and Parakiyā is accepted as a motto, there remains nothing to stand in the way of gross corruption.

In imitation of the Topography of Brindāvana the Sahajīās have located Brindā grove in the breast, Tālabana over the head; the nose has been identified with the grove of Madana (cupid), and the whole body is said to be a pond of Rasa (pleasure).¹ This is not the only instance of misrepresentation. They have taken a passage from the noted Vaiṣṇava writers, which they have interpreted in a curious way in order to justify their own mystic practices. The Chaitanya Charitāmrita formulated that the doctrine of love can not be successfully practised without a Sakhi,² this word being identical with a Guru (e.g., a guiding emotion) in the popular Vaiṣṇava sense; but the Sahajīās have misinterpreted the idea and established the principle that a devotee should be particularly addicted to his own Manjari, and that love cannot grow without adopting a Prakriti,³ taking Prakriti and Manjari in the sense of living women of flesh and blood. When the Charitāmrita asserts that of all the emotions, śṛṅgāra (love) has the greatest flavour, and so it was adopted by Gaurāṅga for spiritual emancipation,⁴ the Sahajīās declare enthusiastically that God can only be realised by indulging in gross sensuality.⁵ It was also asserted by the Sahajīās that each Goswāmi had a Manjari with whom he cultured higher love, thus attributing a woman to each of the noted Vaiṣṇava saints! According to these people, Rupa loved Mirā, Raghunāth Bhatta, Karna Bāi, Sanātana, Lakhahirā, Loke Nāth, a Chandāla girl, Kṛiṣṇa Dās Kavirāj, a milkmaid, Jiva Goswāmi, a barber woman, Raghunāth Dās, Mirābāi, Gopāla Bhatta, Gouripriyā, and Rai Rāmānanda, the temple girls.⁶ Chandidās was noted for

¹ Vide Dehanirnaya Kadachā.

² সখী বিহীন এই লীলা পুষ্টি নাহি হয় ।

³ অনুরক্ত হবে নিজ শৃঙ্গারীর প্রতি ।

তবে হবে শ্রীগুরুপায় কৃষ্ণ প্রাপ্তি ॥

And প্রকৃতি আশ্রয় বিনে প্রেম নাহি হয় ।

⁴ সর্দারস হৈতে শৃঙ্গার অধিক মাধুরী ।

অতএব সেই ভাব আত্মীকার করি ।

সাধিলেন নিজ বস্ত্রা গোরাঙ্গ শ্রীহরি ॥

⁵ কেবল শৃঙ্গার রসে উপাসনা যার ।

সেই সে পাইবে স্বর্গে বহুতর কুমার ॥

⁶ Vide Dr. Sen's Typical Selections, p. 1650.

his love for Rāmi, while Bidyāpati, it is said, fell in love with Lakṣmi Devi, the Queen of Rājā Siva Simha. The Union of Jayadeva and Padmāvati, though it was legalised by marriage, was cited as a precedent in support of Parakiyā love. This utter falsehood in regard to the Vaiṣṇava Gurus was fabricated by the Sahajīās in order to strengthen their wicked doctrine of unrestricted intercourse. Chandidās and a few others, loved women, it is true, but their love was certainly of a higher spiritual plane and should not be confounded with the degraded sensuality of the common Sahajīās. On account of such mischievous activities on the part of the Sahajīās, they have undermined their doctrine in the estimation of the people who avoid them as undesirables.

The reasons advanced in support of Parakiyā some of which we have discussed before are many. We shall however, make brief references to them again leaving aside those which are of somewhat delicate nature. Analyse the nature of a man, you will find, there is a desire for union with woman. Lust is like a serpent residing in our body, which it is constantly biting. Man is hardly able to check this evil tendency. It is for this reason that both men and women are influenced by passion in this Kali Age.”¹ But we can utilise this evil passion for a great purpose. “The first impulse of love can grow in the mind from a desire of the Parakiyā union. Accept a woman whose beauty attracts your mind. You thus experience a feeling which, though crude in its nature, can gradually lead to thirty-two nobler sentiments.”² For it is said, “the emotion Rati is the mother of all

Reasons in support
of Parakiyā.

Dawn of love.

শরীর ভিতর জান আছে কাল সর্প ।
সেই সর্পে দিবানিশি করিছে দংশন ।
কাম নিবারণিতে নাহে জীব নরাধম ॥ অমৃতরহাবলী ।
অকৃতি পুণ্য কলিকালে হবে কামী ।
সংক্ষেপেতে এইমব বচন কহি আশি ॥
কাম লোভ দুই রিপু হইবে প্রবল ।
এই দুই রিপু ধর্ম নাশিবে সকল ॥ রসসারগ্রন্থ ।

সকলশ্রেষ্ঠ পুণ্য রাগ যাহা হৈতে প্রাপ্তি ।
পরকীয়। রসের রসিক জন গতি ।
রূপ লাভহু যার দেখি জন্মে ক্ষোভ ।
প্রাপ্তি কারণে সদা চিন্তে হয় লোভ ॥
পুণ্য রাগের যর এই সদা চিন্ত মনে ।
বিংশতি দ্বাদশ রস ইহার পোষক ॥

other emotions. Rati leads to Prema, Prema to Sneha, Sneha to Praṇaya, Praṇaya to Rāga, Rāga to Anurāga, and Anurāga to Mahābhāva.”¹

1. Rati—Desire.
2. Prema—love.
3. Sneha—steady affection
4. Praṇaya—deep attachment.
5. Rāga—Emotional felicities.
6. Anurāga—a still higher stage in spiritual felicities.
7. Mahābhāva—the highest stage of Vaiṣṇava beatitude, where all that one sees or feels reflects the object of one's love.

The argument seems to be simply this. There are persons in this world who cannot love, for their hearts are hard as stone. If a woman can soften such adamant, it proves that she has the power to effect improvement. Once it is softened, it may breed forth purer sentiments. This seems to be one of the reasons for a Parakiyā union.

¹ প্রথমতঃ রতিভাব বীজবত কয়।

তত্পরি হয় প্রেম ইকুবত সম ॥

স্নেহ হয় রস তার এই অতিক্রম ॥

মানো শুকবত হয় শুনহ বচন ।

প্রণয় ঋণসম করিয়ে গমন ॥ রসসার গ্রন্থ ।

Vide also Bhaktirasāmṛitasindhu—1.3-11

That lust is a great enemy of man cannot be denied. But how can man get rid of his evil passions? The Hindu Śāstras advocate the eradication of the passions by means of austere practices. But the Vaiṣṇavas, as is well known, are of opinion that these passions should not be made extinct, but should be used for the holy purpose of realising God. "The passions of the soul are to be employed for service to Kṛṣṇa, লোভ or greed which is an evil passion, is not so in itself, it becomes a holy passion if it has for its object a communion with Kṛṣṇa. যোহ or grief may thus be purified if it possesses the soul when Kṛṣṇa is lost sight of etc., etc."¹ As for women, they are commonly regarded as undesirable associates for a holy man. Their character is sometimes depicted in the darkest colour in order to create a feeling of disgust against them. The Mahābhārata and the Yogavāsistha Rāmāyaṇa each devotes a whole chapter to the enumeration of the bad qualities of women.² Even the saints like Buddha and Chaitanya tried to avoid women as far as possible. But why is all such hesitation for taking female companions? Not because the women are heinous, but because the men are so weak that they cannot restrain passion in the company of women. Conscious of their own inability to check themselves, they flee from women in terror like a frightened deer. But the Sahajīās take the opposite course. They take Parakiyā women and perform certain secret practices with them according to some prescribed rules in order to make their mind a proof against all temptations. Among these secret practices, one is to select a beautiful woman, to lie at her feet for four months without touching her, to sleep by her side for four months in the same way and then to sleep within her embrace for the same period without indulging in sensuality. This is called the practice of co-operation with women.³ Lust can no

¹ Quoted from the Premabhakti Chandrikā by Dr. Sen, in his Mediaeval Vaiṣṇava Literature, p. 231.

² Chapter XXXII.

Chapter XXI.

³ কায়িক ভজন হ'ব আনুগুলা সেবা।

নিজাঙ্গ সপিলে বস্তু আবর্ততে যোবা ॥

রত্নসার

মানুষ সাধন এই শ্রীঅঙ্গ ভক্তি।

শ্রীমূর্তি সাধুরী সেবা পরম পিরিতি ॥

রত্নসার

doubt be checked to some extent by such training and by practising severe austerities, as is generally done by the Yogis. But the cure effected by the above-noted Sahajīā method is considered radical and thus the selection of Parakiyā is justified.

Another argument advanced in favour of Parakiyā is that it attracts the minds of those who are given up to sensuality to religious subject. Parakiyā is said to be the characteristic feature of the Dvāpara Age, which was fully demonstrated in Vraja by Kṛṣṇa Himself.¹ The celebrated annotator Śrīdhara Swāmi in his explanation of a Sloka² of the Bhāgavata writes—"Why should God adopt Parakiyā which is after all a questionable practice? Because, there are persons in this world who are addicted to sensuality; in order to attract the minds of these people to religious subject by prescribing methods suited to their taste, God played the part of love amours in Vrindāvana."³ The motive is, no doubt, praiseworthy, for it aims at the welfare of those who are treated with contempt by all other societies.

Further, Parakiyā is said to be better than Svakiyā. The latter is supported by custom and usages, as well as by the authority of the Śāstras, but there is little novelty in it. There is no freedom in such love, and consequently it soon becomes stale. But the Parakiyā love is said to be the source of deep enjoyment.⁴ Madhura Rasa embraces in it the other four Rasas, namely, Śānta, Dāsyā, Sakhyā and Vātsalyā. These five Rasas can be enjoyed by adopting both Svakiyā and Parakiyā, but the pangs of separation is less in the former, and consequently it is less interesting than the latter. Thus Parakiyā

1 "জুগধর্মা পরকীয়া দ্বাপরে জানিবে ।"
"ব্রজের মাধুরী রস পরকীয়া হয় ।"
"বলং ভগবান কৃষ্ণ ভরথ মুখে শুনি ।
দ্বাপরে আবাদে রস লইঞা অংশিনী ॥"
"কন্দর্প বিগ্রহ তেহ ব্রজেতে বিলাস ।"

2 অনুগ্রহায় ভক্তানাং মানুষং দেহ মাশ্রিতঃ ।
ভক্তে তাদৃশী ক্রিয়া যাঃ শ্রদ্ধা তৎপরে ভবেৎ ॥ ভাগবত—১.১৩.৩৬

3 শৃঙ্গাররসাকৃষ্ট চেতসো বহিমুখাঙ্গপি স্বপরাং কঠুমিতিভাবঃ

4 পরকিয়া রাগ অতি রসের উল্লাস ।

enjoys one Rasa, *i.e.*, that of separation, more than Svakiyā.¹ Another argument in favour of Parakiyā is that Svakiyā gives the opportunity of uninterrupted legalised sensuality, whereas Parakiyā is not so. Because Svakiyā is authorised by the Śāstras and the social custom, there is nothing to question its propriety—no matter what amount of sensuality one can indulge in in the company of one's married wife. But alas! Parakiyā is beset with danger and check, and consequently its scope of going to excess is very limited.² The superiority of Parakiyā is further established by the classification of the various Ratis. They are of three kinds, namely, Sāmarthā, Sāmanjasyā and Sādhārani. It is stated that Sāmanjasyā is shallow love as is generated between husband and wife, while Sāmarthā is deep love as was experienced by the Gopis for Kṛṣṇa.³ Thus Parakiyā is considered sound and deep, while Svakiyā is merely a semblance of love.⁴ Chandidās says—"One should adopt Parakiyā because it is the best of all."⁵ This view is also supported in the Chaitanya Charitāmrita which says, "Parakiyā breeds deep love."⁶ Dr. D. C. Sen narrates a conversation he once had with an old Sahajīa woman. In order to compare the love of Svakiya and Parakiyā she said—"Ladies noted for chastity like Sitā and Sābitri, were bound to remain faithful in

- ১ কিস্ত সে শান্তির ভাব হয় পঞ্চরসে ।
স্বকীয়া পরকীয়া তাতে দুই পরকাসে ॥
স্বকীয়া অনুবাদ করি বেদের কারণ ।
বিচ্ছেদের ভয় নাই সমুখ সাধন ॥
নিশ্চয় পরকীয়া রস একক সাধন । রত্নসার ।
- ২ স্বকীয়া রমনী করি সংসারিআ জনে ।
কামে উন্নতা করে ইন্দ্রিয় পোসনে ॥
নিজদেহ পুত করি শুল্লার করয় ।
স্বকীয়া বেদের উক্তি তাথে নাক্রী ভয় ॥ রত্নসার
- ৩ বহুভাগে বহু যত্নে কৌস্তভ মনি মিলে ।
ব্রজ দেবীগণে ইহা মিলে অবহেলে ॥
সেইত সামর্থ্য রতি যে যে গুণ ধরে ।
বাঞ্ছ করি কহি তাগা শুন সাবধানে ॥
পটমহিষী সমগ্রসা রতি হয় ।
অনুরাগ পর্যন্ত এই জানিহ নিশ্চয় ॥ রত্নসার
- ৪ পরকীয়া রাগ অতি রসের উল্লাস ।
স্বকীয়াতে রাগ নাই কেবল আভাস ॥
- ৫ পরকীয়া ধন সকল প্রধান
যতন করিয়া লই ।
- ৬ পরকীয়া ভাবে অতি রসের উল্লাস ।

consideration of their social status, for their love of fame and praise, and for fear of public censure. They could never rise above the prejudices of custom and usages, but always kept themselves confined within the limit prescribed by the conventional Śāstras, for the hope of earning merit in this world and happiness in the next. It merits little praise to remain constant in consideration of so much gain. But take the case of a Parakiyā woman. She forgets herself for love, sacrifices everything—her home, relatives, and social status—for love only. People speak ill of her, but she is deaf; men spit upon her, but she is unflinching. No amount of torture and contempt can dissuade her from the path she follows. Is not this passing through the crucial test of constancy, and her victory more bright than the purest gold? Rādhā did this, and so she stands unique in love. Love should be the watch-word, and none can be deeper in it than a Parakiyā." An example of this sort of love is found illustrated in the life of late Durgāprosād Kar who loved a woman named Monmohini with wonderful doggedness. The story has been elaborately described by Dr. D. C. Sen in his "Chaitanya and His Age" (*vide* pp. 361-366). In Ratnasāra, the writer proves the superiority of Parakiyā by a nice little story. The daughter of a king fell in love with a young man, the son of another king. They used to meet secretly within a grove by the side of a river flowing through a dense forest. The couple found their enjoyment full and perfect. But it so chanced that the young man was once caught by the men of the girl's father, who, on hearing about the love-affair, married the couple. It was the ফুলশয্যা or the "Flower-bed" night, the king's palace was lighted with all brilliance, and every preparation was made for the enjoyment of the bride and the bridegroom. But, lying on the ivory couch, surrounded by the luxuries of every description, the couple now found their enjoyment less charming than what they had experienced in the forest grove! This was due to the transfer of a Parakiyā to Svakiyā. The religion founded on such principles, is highly attractive to the common people. The effect can easily be imagined. The Sahajīā doctrine was acclaimed by the common folk, among whom it is still confined.

TĀNTRIKISM AND SAHAJĪĀ.

The Sahajīā doctrine is greatly indebted to Tāntrikism for many of its practices and religious tenets. I had had occasions to point out before how the Sahajīās, like the Tāntriks, take Parakiyā companions for mystic practices. It has also been pointed out that the followers of these two creeds pay little heed to the orthodox view advocating the necessity of restraining the activities of the senses for spiritual culture, and do not at all observe the caste-rules about the selection of female associates. They have thus created an atmosphere of individual freedom within the precincts of these creeds rendering them very attractive to the common people. But by far the greatest triumph of the Sahajīās, as well as of the Tāntriks, is that they have greatly raised the status of women in their societies, where, in many respects, they occupy a position more honourable than that enjoyed by their sisters in the Hindu community. They worship woman, respect her freedom, and treat her as an equal partner in spiritual culture. Their favourite maxim is that no worship is valid without a female companion. In these respects the Sahajīās and the Tāntriks see eye to eye, and there are clear indications that the former extensively borrowed from the latter, as the following discussion will show.

The Sahajīā literature abounds in passages which seem to echo the sentiments expressed in some Tantrik verses, with this difference that what the Sahajīās borrowed they moulded with the stamp of their own religion. The following quotations will clearly point out these similarities:—

In describing the necessity of taking a female companion, the

Group I. Tantras say—

“ No worship can be done without women (Śakti), fish, meat, etc.”¹

“ If a devotee be engaged in worship without taking a Parakiyā companion, he will not be successful even by reciting the Mantras hundred crores of time.”²

বিনা শক্তিং ন পূজাস্তি মন্ত্ৰং মাংসং বিনা ত্রিয়ে ।

^১ বিনা পরকিয়া দেবি জপেং যদি তু সাধকঃ ।

শতকোটি জপে নৈব তন্ন সিদ্ধি র্ণ জায়তে ॥

The Śiva Tantra.

The following Sahajīā verses seem to be an exact echo of the sentiments expressed above—

“ If you do not be addicted to a Manjari, *i.e.*, woman, you cannot get Kṛṣṇa by your spiritual culture.”¹

“ You should worship by being associated with a Manjari, *i.e.*, woman.”²

“ Worship God in the company of a Prakriti, *i. e.*, woman.”³

The difference is in nomenclature merely ; the women are designated as Śaktis by the Tāntrics, while the Sahajīās call them Manjaris, Prakritis, etc.

The Tantras say that the act of union with women should be
Group II. practised in mind—

“A devotee should think in his mind as if he is enjoying with a Svakiyā or Parakiyā woman.”⁴

“ A worshipper should perform everything in imagination, for then only he can attain success.”⁵

The Sahajīās tell about the same thing thus—

“ You should think in your mind about the union with Rupa, and thus worship Kṛṣṇa.”⁶

“ The cravings for gross enjoyment should be subdued and union should be sought in mind only.”⁷

“ Sahajīā mode of worship should always be practised in mind only.”⁸

“ Always think of the union even in dreams as in wakefulness.”⁹

¹ মঞ্জরী অমুগা বিনে বিষয়ের জ্ঞানে ।

না পাইবে ভক্তি। সে শ্রীরাধার মনে ॥

² মঞ্জরী আশ্রয় হইয়া করিতে সেবন ।

³ প্রকৃতি লইয়া তায় করহ সাধন ।

⁴ স্বকীয়ঃ পরকীয়ঃ বা মানসস্ত রমেৎ স্ত্রিয়ং ।

⁵ সর্ব্বস্ত মানসং কুৰ্ঘ্যাতেন সিদ্ধতি সাধকঃ ॥

⁶ মনেতে করহ রতি শ্রীরূপ পরাণ পতি

শ্রীকৃষ্ণ ভজন কর নার ।

⁷ নিজমুখ নাই মাত্র আশ্রিতে রমন ।

⁸ সহজ ভজন মনে করহ সর্ব্বথা ।

⁹ স্বপনে বিপনে সদা করিবে সঙ্গম ।

The Śiva Saṁhitā says that everything originated from spirit, so
 Group III. a man should take refuge in spirit, giving up all
 other supports.”¹

The following verse of the Sahajiā work named Rasa-Ratnasāra
 is an exact translation of this sentiment :—

চৈতন্য হইতে সৰ্ব হয় উৎপাদিত ।

সৰ্বত্যাগি চৈতন্যের আশ্রয় বিহিত ॥

The Sahajiā writers make no secret of this debt. In plain terms
 they say that they have copied these ideas from
 The Sahajiā writers admit this. the Tāntric works. They have also mentioned
 the names of the books which served as their
 models.

In Āgama Grantha, the author, after preliminary invocations,
 proceeds by saying, “ This book will deal with the subject which
 Śiva heard in the Āgama about the mystic religion, and which he
 afterwards narrated to Pārvati.”²

The author of Rasaratnasāra writes—“ Narottama asked his Guru
 about the mode of worship.” The Guru said, “ Hear Narottama, I
 am telling you what was written in the Śiva Saṁhitā by Śiva-
 Himself.”³

In the Nigudhārtha Prakāśāvalī the writer says—

“Know it for certain that I have written here what I found
 described in the preliminary verses of the book named Āgamasāra.”⁴

In Ratnasāra, the author undoubtedly refers to the Tantras
 by saying that the Parakiyā mode of worship is supported by
 the Śāstras.⁵

¹ চৈতন্যং সৰ্বমুৎপন্নং জগদেতচ্চরিতং ।
 তস্মাৎ সৰ্বং পরিত্যজ্য চৈতন্যস্থ সমাশ্রয়েৎ ॥

² শিব রহস্তাগমে জে কথা শুনি।
 পার্বতীরে সরা শিব সে কথা কহিল ॥

³ কি রূপ সে সাধনের পন্থা কহ আমি ॥
 শুন নরোত্তম তবে সেই তত্ত্ব কথা ।
 শিব সাহিত্যে শিব প্রকাশিলা বাহা ॥

⁴ আগমসার মঙ্গলচরণে কয় ।
 সে পন্থার লিখিলাম জানিবে নিশ্চয় ॥

⁵ পরকিয়া ভাবে সিদ্ধ আছে সান্ত জুক্তি

In Amritarasāvali, the author thus alludes to his indebtedness to the Tāntric doctrine—

“He (Śiva) wrote¹ about Himself in the preliminary verses of the book named Āgamasāra. Any one desiring to know it, can do so by consulting that book. It was composed in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and Pārvati.”¹

Even the celebrated² Vaiṣṇava writer, Jayānanda, seems to have been influenced by the Tāntric works, as will be seen from the following quotations :—

“Nārada told this to Uddhava. Originally Brahmā asked Śiva about this matter. It was then told by Vyāsa to his disciple Jaimini. Jaimini Saṁhitā is like the tree of plenty yielding whatever one may desire of it.”²

That Sahajīā doctrine is a form of mystic religion, has been thus alluded to in the Āgama Grantha—

“Śiva says, ‘Hear, O Goddess (Pārvati), I am telling you the secret truth. You perhaps do not know that you are a Sahajīā by birth.’”³

That the Sahajīā doctrine is not a new religion has been thus acknowledged by Prema Dāsa in Ānandabhairava—

“This form of worship was current in early times.”⁴

It will thus be seen that the Sahajīā writers are indebted to Tāntrikism in more than one way. For the idea of Parakiyā worship they are wholly indebted to the Tantras, for we know of no other religion which was ever established on that principle. They have also adopted the nerve and lotus theory of the Tantras without

The nerve, lotus and pond systems.

- ¹ আপনার তত্ত্ব তিঁহ লিখেন আপনে ।
আগম সার গ্রন্থের মঙ্গলচরনে ॥
তার তত্ত্ব শুনিতে যদি কব্ব লোভ হয় ।
আগমসার দেখিলে পাবে তাহার নির্ণয় ॥
শিব দুর্গার বাক্য লক্ষ্য কর্যাছি বর্ণন ॥
- ² এই কথা নারদ কহিল উদ্ধবেরে ।
পূর্বের ব্রহ্মা জিজ্ঞাসিয়াছিল। মহেশ্বরে ॥
জৈমিনি শিষ্টেরে ব্যাস কহেন সে কথা ।
জৈমিনি সংহিতা ত্রিগুণতে কল্পলতা ॥
শিববলে শুন দেবি শ্রুত বিষয়ণ ।
সহজের জাতি তুমি না বুঝ কারণ ॥
এইমত সাধন ভজন পূর্ব হৈতে রাখে ।

much modifications. The Amritaratnāvali Dehanirṇaya Grantha and Niguḍhārthaprakāśāvali deal extensively with the positions of nerves, lotuses and ponds. Even the celebrated poet Chandidās, in giving expositions of the Sahajīā doctrine in his Rāgātmikā Padas, copied from the Tantras. He is by far the most noted Sahajīā writer, and has given a poetic charm to a complicated theology. In dealing with these theories we must have occasion to refer to the Śaṭchakra theory of the Tantras which is too well-known to require any explanation here. The quotations from the Sahajīā books will show that these theories have been worked out by the Sahajīās in their own way in order to develop a distinctive creed with the materials supplied by the Tantras.

The Niguḍhārthaprakāśāvali locates seven ponds in the human body. The theory of Ponds. body :—

“At the navel there is the Navel Pond wherein is situated the Jaḍa lotus. On the head is the Akṣaya Pond with a lotus with thousand petals. Below this, there is Kantha Pond with a lotus with four petals. Then comes the Kṣīra Pond in the breast with a lotus of eight petals. Māna Pond is located in the abdomen with a lotus of hundred petals. Then there is Prithu Pond near about the navel (perhaps separated from the Navel Pond) with a lotus of six petals. Ghora Pond is at the private part of the body with a lotus with two petals. These six, with the Jaḍa lotus noted above, make up seven lotuses.”¹

We shall now see how the six Chakras have been located within the human body in the Tantras. “Mulādhāra is a triangular space

নাভিস্থানে নাভি সরোবর জড়পদ্ম তায় ॥
 মস্তকে অক্ষয় সরোবর সহস্রদল ইথে ।
 তার নিচে কণ্ঠ সরোবর জানিবে নিশ্চিত ॥
 চতুর্দশ পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নিশ্চয় ।
 হৃদয় ভিতর ক্ষীর সরোবর হয় ।
 অষ্টদল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নিশ্চয় ॥
 উদর ভিতরে মান সরোবর কয় ।
 শতদল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নিশ্চয় ॥
 পৃথু নাভির নাম পৃথু সরোবর ।
 ষড়দল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নির্দ্বার ॥
 ঘোর সরোবর হয় নির্জল স্থানেতে ।
 দুইদল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নিশ্চিত ॥
 ছয় পদ্ম এক জড় সপ্ত এই কয় ।

in the midmost part of the body. It is described as a red lotus of four petals, situated between the base of the sexual organ and the anus. Svādhīsthāna is a six-petalled lotus at the base of the sexual organ, above Mūlādhāra and below the navel." Manipura is at the navel, it has ten petals. Anāhata is in the breast, it has twelve petals, Viśuddha is at the neck, it has sixteen petals, while Ajñā is at the brow with two petals. Above all is the Sahasrāra with thousand petals."

It should be observed that the Sahajīās, like the Tāntrics, count seven lotuses, but they have introduced some modifications in the number of petals which each lotus possesses. Moreover, they have changed the positions of some of them : two have been placed near about the navel, while the place of the Ajñā has been kept vacant, and a new lotus named Māna has been introduced in the abdomen. The names of the ponds and lotuses are also different. But from the description given by the Sahajīās it is quite evident that they must have copied from the Tantras with some suitable modifications to serve their own purpose.

According to the psycho-physiological theory of the Tantras The Nāḍī System. there are three and a half crores of nerves in the human body.¹ Of these nerves, the principal are the fourteen, and of these fourteen, Iḍā, Pingalā and Suṣumnā are the chief, and, again, of these three Suṣumnā is the greatest and to it all others are subordinate. The other nerves are Gāndhārī, Hastijihvikā, Kuhu, Sarasvatī, Pusā, Śankhinī, Payasvinī, Bāruṇī, Alambusā, Visvodarī, and Jasasvinī. But according to Tōḍala Tantra there are only eleven nerves which are considered important ; they are thus named in this book :—Iḍā, Pingalā, Suṣumnā, Citrinī, Brahmanāḍī, Kuhu, Śankhinī, Gāndhārī, Hastijihvikā, Narddīnī, and Nidrā. It should thus be observed that opinions vary among the Tāntric authors as to the number and names of the important nerves.

The Nigūḍārthaprakāśāvalī, on the other hand, gives importance to thirty-two nerves which are thus named in this book :—Śūṇyā, Dīptā, Kiraṇ, Dhira, Rati, Tāmra, Kānti, Ujjvala, Kambu, Darasaṇa,

¹ সাক্ষলকৃত্রয়ো নান্যাতঃ সন্তি দেহান্তরে নৃণাম্ ।
প্রধানকৃত্তা নান্যন্ত তাস্থ মূখ্যাশ্চতুর্দশ ॥
হৃদয়েড়াপিঙ্গলা চ গাকারী হস্তিজিহ্বিকা ।
কুহঃ সরস্বতী পুবা শঙ্খিনী চ পয়স্বিনী ॥
বারুণ্যালম্বুবা চৈব বিষৌদরী যশস্বিনী ।
এতাহ তিশ্রো মূখ্যা ইয়াঃ পিঙ্গলেড়াহবুঝিকাঃ ॥

Lakṣaḥaṇa, Dagdhahema, Sārāsāra, Subasa, Subhadra, Nīscindha, Hingalā, Pingalā, Sun-coloured, Moon-coloured, Kṣīroda-Śāyī, Garbhodakaśāyī,¹ etc., etc.

Of these thirty-two nerves, four are said to be the chief. From them all other nerves originate. Animals take their birth from the nerve, which has the colour of the sun. From the nerve, named Garbhodakaśāyī, originate those of the created beings who are accustomed to the Svakiyā mode of worship. From the Kṣīrodaśāyī nerve are born those who are the worshippers of Kṛṣṇa, while the nerve, which has the colour of the moon, produces the Sahajīās who are called the worshippers of love.²

শুভ্র নাড়ী শুভ্র কুঠি এই নাম কয় ।
 দীপ্ত কোটা দীপ্ত নাড়ী আছেয়ে শরীরে ।
 কিরণ কুটা কিরণ-নাড়ী রজঃগুণ স্থিতি ।
 ধীর কুটা ধীর-নাড়ী তমঃগুণে স্থিতি ।
 হিন্দুলা কুটা হিন্দুলা-নাড়ী জানিবে নিশ্চয়ে ।
 রতি কুটা রতি-নাড়ী অধরামৃত পানে ।
 তাত্ত্ব কুটা তাত্ত্ব-নাড়ী ব্রহ্মাণ্ডে রহে ।
 কান্তি কুটা কান্তি-নাড়ী রক্ত নিশ্চয়ে ।
 উজ্জল কুটা উজ্জল-নাড়ী স্বয়ং সদাশিব রহে ।
 কঙ্ক কুটা কঙ্ক-নাড়ী করিব গণন ।
 এক কুটা নাম তার নাম লক্ষবান ।
 আর কুটা নাম হয় দ্বন্দ্বহেম ।
 সারাসার বলি এক কুটা যে আছেয় ।
 আর এক কুটা নাম শুবস বলি কয় ।
 শুভ্র নামেতে এক কুটা জে নিশ্চয় ।
 ধির আর নিশ্চয় ছই নাড়ী জোড়া ।
 সেই ছই নাড়ী আছে নিলিয়া পয়ে বেড়া ।
 উর্দ্ধমুখে হিন্দুলা-নাড়ী আছে যে নিশ্চয় ।
 অধমুখে পিঙ্গলা-নাড়ীত আছেয় ।

etc., etc., etc.

² আর চারি নাড়ী জে প্রধান বস্তু হয় ।
 এই চারি হৈতে সব নাড়ী নিশ্চয় ॥
 অরুণ বর্ণ নাড়ী তাতে মূত্র নাড়ী হয় ।
 পশুগণের মূত্র-নাড়ী জন্ম নিশ্চয় ॥
 গর্ভোদকশায়ী মনের নাড়ী হয় ।
 সৃষ্টি আদি স্বকীয়ার জন্ম ইথে হয় ॥
 ক্রোধোদশায়ী নাড়ী সকলের সার !
 ক্রোধোদকশায়ী ইহাতে নিষ্কার ॥
 চন্দ্রশায়ী নাড়ী হয় সত্যার উত্তম ।
 চৈতন্যরূপা রসিকভক্ত ইহাতে জনম ॥

This sort of differentiation about the different types of creation is peculiar to the Sahajīās. It should be observed that the author of Nigudāarthaprakāśāvalī got the idea of nerves from the Tantras, but he has developed the subtle theory of the nerve system in his own way. On the other hand, Caṇḍīdāsa has exactly copied from the Tantras without depending upon his own imaginative power to invent new names and classifications, as the following discussion will show :—

About the lotuses he says—

“ How wonderful is the creation of the Great Creator ! He has located six lotuses within the body. The
The theories of Caṇḍīdāsa. Sahasrāra is a lotus of thousand petals, below which is Maṇipura wherein resides the great Siva. At the base of the nose there is a two-petalled lotus looking like the twin eyes of the bird khanjana. In the throat, He has placed a lotus with sixteen petals, whereas in the region of the heart there is a lotus with hundred petals. At the navel is Kulakuṇḍalini with ten petals and a little below is the Prema-Pond wherein is situate a lotus with eight petals.”¹

In this description, Maṇipura has been placed in the head somewhere above the base of the nose, but in the Tantras it is located at the navel. Caṇḍīdāsa has also placed Kulakuṇḍalini in the place of the Maṇipura of the Tantras. Here he speaks of the lotus of the breast as a flower with hundred petals, while the Tantras make it a twelve-petalled one. He is, however, accurate in the following description—

“ According to another version, there is a thousand-petalled lotus in the head. Between the eye-brows is situated a lotus with two petals, while that at the neck is a sixteen-petalled one. The lotus

- ¹ কিবা কারিকরের আজ্ঞা কারিকুরি ।
তার মধ্যে ছয় পদ্ম রাখিয়াছে পুরি ॥
সহস্রারে হয় পদ্ম সহস্রক দল ।
তার তলে মণিপূর্য পদ্ম শিবের স্থল ॥
নাসায়ূলে দ্বিদল পদ্ম খঞ্জনাঙ্কি ।
কণ্ঠে রাখি বোড়শ দল পদ্ম দিল রাখি ॥
হৃৎপদ্ম নির্মিত আছে শতদলে ।
কুলকুণ্ডলিনী দশ দল হয় নাভীমূলে ॥
নাভির নিম্নভাগে প্রেম-সরোবর ।
অষ্টদল পদ্ম হয় তাহার ভিতর ॥

of the heart has twelve petals, and of the navel ten only. At the base of the generative organ there is a lotus with six petals, while that at the anus contains fourteen petals.”¹

Here the description of the lotus of the anus does not tally with that of the Tantras, but it seems that the manuscript has not been correctly deciphered. The word should be চতুর্দল (four-petalled) instead of চতুর্দশ (fourteen-petalled), as has been written by Caṇḍīdāsa himself in another place.²

There is one point worthy of special importance here. It should be observed how the psycho-physiological Chakra of the Tāntrics has been converted into Pond by the Sahajīās. Caṇḍīdāsa was writing about the lotuses situated in the various Chakras, while abruptly he came down to note—“Below the navel there is the Prema Pond wherein is situated a lotus with eight petals.”³ Navel is the place of the Maṇipura Chakra according to the Tāntric theory, and the place of the Svādhiṣṭhāna is below it somewhere at the base of the sexual organ. It is quite evident that this Svādhiṣṭhāna Chakra has been transferred to the Prema Pond by Caṇḍīdāsa. The Sahajīās are the worshippers of love, and deep love is very often expressed with the apt simile of pond, river, ocean, etc. It is for this reason that the metaphysical Chakra of the Tāntrics has been converted into Pond by the Sahajīās. This is undoubtedly the origin of their pond-theory, which has been variously worked out by different Sahajīā writers. In describing the subtle nerve system, Caṇḍīdāsa imitated the Tāntric model.

- ¹ মতান্তরে যে কহয়ে শুনহ নিশ্চয় ।
মস্তক উপরে সহস্রদল পদ্ম হয় ॥
ক্রমধ্যে দ্বিদল কণ্ঠে ষোল দল ।
হৃদিমধ্যে ষাদশ নাভিমূলে দশদল ॥
লিঙ্গমূলে ষড়্‌দল চতুর্দশ গুহমূলে ॥

- ² লিঙ্গমূলে ষড়্‌দলাবুজ নিয়োজিত ।
গুহমূলে চতুর্দল পদ্ম বিরাজিত ॥

- ³ নাভির নিম্নভাগে প্রেম-সরোবর ।
অষ্টদল পদ্ম হয় তাহার ভিতর ॥

Also

রতিস্থির প্রেম-সরোবর অষ্টদলে ।
সাধনের মূল এই চণ্ডীদাস বলে ॥

“The six Chakras are fixed in the cerebro-spinal axis as their main support. It penetrates through the whole body and extends up to the head. It has Iḍā and Pingalā on the two sides, with the nerve Suṣumnā in the middle.”¹

In order to show that this has been exactly copied from the Tantras, we quote here the translation of Mr. Arthur Avalon (Justice Woodroffe):—

“Sushumnā is in the hollow of the Meru in the cerebro-spinal axis. It extends from the Mulādhāra lotus to the cerebral region. It..... has within it the Vajrini-Nāḍi... .. Within the latter is the pale nectar-dropping Chitrā..... The various lotuses in the different Chakras of the body are all suspended from the Chitra-Nāḍi, the Chakras being described as knots in the Nāḍi, which is as thin as the thousandth part of a hair. Outside the Meru and on each side of the Sushumnā are the Nāḍis Iḍā and Pingalā. Iḍā is on the left side, and coiling round Sushumnā has its exit in the left nostril, Pingalā is on the right and similarly coiling enters the right nostril.”

Then, again, Caṇḍīdāsa says—

“In the human body there are three-and-a-half crores of nerves. Some of them are thin, and some thick, but thirty-two among them are very prominent.”²

The three-and-a-half crores of nerves have, as has been already pointed out, been adopted from the Tantric mode of computation. But the Sahajīās, of course Caṇḍīdāsa is one of them, give prominence to thirty-two of them, while the Tantras name eleven or fourteen as the chief nerves. In this respect the view of Caṇḍīdāsa does not disagree with that of the other Sahajīā writers.

Further, Caṇḍīdāsa writes—

“The Mulādhāra Chakra is the seat of spiritual culture. The eight-petalled Chakra is the source of creation. Nectar resides in the two-petalled flower, other five Chakras are the seats of five

¹ ষটচক্রের মূল মৃণাল হয় মেরুদণ্ড ।
শিরসি পর্য্যন্ত সে ভেদ করি অণ্ড ॥
দণ্ড দুই পার্শ্বেতে ঈড়া পিঙ্গলা রহে ।
মধ্য-স্থিত সুসুমা সদা প্রবল বহে ॥

² তন্ত্র পরে নাড়ী ধরে সার্ব্ব তিন কোটি ।
মূল হস্ত বজ্রিশ তারি কিবা পরিপাটি ॥

kinds of Vāyu (airs, which are called the inner vital forces), namely, Prāṇa, Apāna, Vyāna, Samāna, Udāna.”¹

In the Tantras, Mulādhāra is said to be the seat of the Kuṇḍalinī Śakti, the rousing of which is the object of the Tantric practices. Caṇḍidāsa speaks about the same thing when he says that the Mulādhāra Chakra is the seat of spiritual culture. Now, the eight-petalled Chakra is, according to Caṇḍidāsa, as quoted before, the Svādhiṣṭhāna Chakra which is situated at the base of the generative organs. It is for this reason that this Chakra is said to be the source of creation. Again, the two-petalled Chakra is the Ājñā Chakra of the Tantrics, which is also the seat of nectar. The five forms of airs, namely, Prāṇa, Apāna, Vyāna, Samāna, Udāna, are well-known in the Tantric literature. So, we find that Caṇḍidāsa is greatly indebted to the Tantras for the exposition of the nerve and lotus theories, as described in his Rāgātmikā padas. The exceedingly intricate nature of this philosophy of our physical system is a hard nut to crack for laymen, and indeed we frankly confess that much of these has been inexplicable to us. The Hon’ble Mr. Woodroffe, Justice of the Calcutta High Court, has devoted his whole life to the solution of problems which appear as gibberish to most of our educated men of the present day. The mystic cult is, however, still practised and we cannot treat it with due respect until it has been put to scrutiny and closely examined.

SAHAJIĀ THEOLOGY.

THE HEAVEN OF THE SAHAJIĀS.

Every religion of the world has its conception of a blissful abode in heaven to where the true followers go after death. The Paradise of the Christians, the Vehesta of the Mahomedans, the Vaikuṇṭha of the Vaiṣnavas, the Kailāsa of the Śaivas, and the Brahma Loka, Indra, Loka, etc., of the other Hindu sects are places of perpetual blisses, which have been conceived in order to point out to the people

¹ মূল চক্র হয় হংস-যোগের আধার ।
 অষ্টদল চক্রে লীলার সঞ্চার ॥
 দ্বিদল চক্রেতে হয় অমৃত নির্ভর ।
 আর পঞ্চ চক্রে পঞ্চ বায়ুর সঞ্চার ॥
 প্রাণ অপান ব্যান উদান সমান ।
 কণ্ঠাধুজাবধি চতুর্দলে অবস্থান ॥

that those among them who are good and true, should go there after the close of their earthly career. The Buddhists speak of Nirvāṇa as the highest object of attainment, but they are bound to the idea that the attainment of emancipation is dependent upon the good works of many births, and that a man repairs to "Sukhavati" or the abode of bliss after death each time he is born, until he is finally emancipated. This is no doubt a very effective way of encouraging people to the performance of good deeds. The Sahajiās also speak of heaven in their own way. The modern Sahajiā creed of Bengal is nothing but a bye-product of Buddhism and Vaiṣṇavism, and it can, therefore, be expected that the Sahajiās must have been greatly influenced by the conception of heaven much on the lines of the Buddhists and the Vaiṣṇavas. An enquiry into this matter is of great importance to find out the true aspect of the Sahajiā doctrine.

In the Amritarasāvali of Mukunḍa Dāsa we have a description of the highest blissful abode of heaven in the following manner ¹ :—

"The abode of mystic Candrapura is situated very far off, towards the fourteenth Loka. A curious race of men dwells there. They are neither afflicted with the infirmity of old age, nor are subject to death. There is a wonderful temple in that City, which cannot be perceived by human vision ; and in a corner of that house, symbolical of pure love, there reside a pair of youth of opposite sex, incapable of being perceived by any man. In that corner of pure love live those who have acquired a knowledge of the emotion of love by spiritual culture, that is, those who have earned the knowledge of self through love. That place is supremely divine,

^১ শুগুচন্দ্রপুর সেই অনেক দূর
 চৌদ্দ ভুবনের কাছে ।
 নাহিক অর্য কেহো নহে মর্য
 কি জাতি মানুষ আছে ॥
 ক জাতি মন্দির নহে সে গোচর
 রস কোন হয় তার ।
 তাহার ভিতর কিশোরি কিশোর
 না হয় গোচর কার ॥
 সেইরস কোন বৈসে রসিক জন
 নিজের আগয় হয় ।
 ঘাহার শুণে আপমা চিনে
 সেই জন তথাই রয় ॥

and is, as it were, the source of this universe. In area it is as big as the physical universe itself and it is everlasting, continuing through ages, without being subject to destruction. The sun has no power to enter that region, and the teachings of the Vedas cannot describe it. The wind has also no access to that place, and even the moon cannot shine there. The darkness of the place is dispelled by the lustre of its own brightness. Many were the persons bent upon going there, but none could enter into its limit. It is not known to gods like Śiva and Haladhara, and even the Lord of Goloka (the Heaven of the Vaiṣṇavas) is constantly thinking of it.”

This is the conception of the Candrapura according to one of the best writers of the Sahajīā doctrine.

In the Ātmatattva Grantha the subject is treated thus :—

“Above all (that is, above Goloka) there is the abode of everlasting Vṛindāvana, where in a throne of diamond are seated a Kīśora and a Kīśorī (a lad and a lass at the dawn of youth)”¹

The Amṛitaratnāvalī thus speaks about this ideal place :—

“The eternal man resides in the abode of perpetual bliss.”

“For that man alone (who is absolutely free from all bondage), is the land of everlasting joy. He is the eternal man who lives in that eternal abode.”

“This place of perpetual bliss is on the bank of a zigzag river which flows at the foot of its northern gate. It courses about meanderingly, the water rushing against the flow tide. Towards the western side, is the hamlet of Sahajapura, which is the everlasting

দিব্য সেই স্থল	সংসারের মূল
তত ক্রোশ হয় স্থান ।	
সেই স্থান অক্ষয়	যুগে যুগে রয়
প্রলয়ে নাহিক জান ॥	
হৃদ্য নাহি চলে	বেদ নাহি বলে
পবনের নাহি গতি ।	
না চলে চন্দ্র	নাশয়ে ধন
কিবা সে স্থানের জ্যোতি ॥	
কত শত জন	কৈল বহু শ্রম
কেহত যাইতে নারে ।	
শিব হলধর	সে নহে গোচর
গোলোক নাথ ভাবে যারে ॥	

¹ সর্বোপরি নিত্য বৃন্দাবন অবস্থিত । সেখানে রত্ন সিংহাসনে কিশোর কিশোরী বিরাজমান ।

abode of the emancipated. The sun and moon do not shine there, and even the wind does not blow. The place is invested with lustres like those of saphire, the moon and of the sun, which conjointly perform the work of the sun.”¹

In another place the poet is more explicit about the name of this river, and gives a detailed description of the place ² :—

That country is on the bank of the river named Virajā. It bears the name of Sahajapura, a place of perpetual bliss. On the northern side (of that Sahajapura) is situated the hamlet called Ānandapura. In the south of the Ānandapura is Cidānandapura, with the adjoining village named Candrakānti Deśa. (Calcutta University MSS. No. 595, p. 3.)

N. B.—It should be noted in this connection that the river on the bank of which Sahajapura is said to be situated is here clearly named as Virajā. This river of zigzag course has been variously referred to in other Sahajīā works :—

In the Nigūḍārthaprakāśāvalī, Gaurī Dāsa, in describing the process of creation, says—

¹ শতসিক্ত মাছুষ আছে সদানন্দ দেশ ।

* * * *

সেই মাছুষের হয় সদানন্দ গ্রাম ।

নিত্যের মাছুষ সেই নিত্য বস্তু ধাম ॥

* * * *

সদানন্দ গ্রাম সেই বাকানদী পারে ।

বাকানদী বহে তার উত্তর দ্বারে ॥

তাহার গমনভঙ্গি বন্ধিম স্তম্ভাম ।

বহিছে তাহার জল স্রোতের উজান ॥

চন্দ্র সূর্য্যোদয় নাই না চলে পবন ।

নীলকান্তি চন্দ্রকান্তি সূর্য্যকান্তি হয়

এ তিনের কান্তিছটায় হয় সূর্য্যোদয় ॥

* * * *

² বিরোজা নদীর পার সেই দেশ থান ।

সহজপুর সদানন্দ নামে সেই গ্রাম ।

* * * *

তাহার উত্তর দিকে আনন্দপুর গ্রাম ।

* * * *

তাহার দক্ষিণ দিকে চিদানন্দপুর ।

চন্দ্রকান্তি দেশ নাম কিঞ্চিৎ হয় দূর ॥

Mayā (or **Prakṛiti**) lives on the bank of the river **Virajā** (she being viewed by the Supreme Lord, gives birth to the created objects.)¹

In another place, the author says that a wave from the **Akṣaya** pond wherein lives **Paramātmā**, rushed into the river **Virajā**, and thence to **Rebā** and **Yamunā**.²

In the **Ratnasāra** we have—"The ideal **Sahajīā** Being lives on the bank of the river **Virajā**," p. 50.

"A quarter manifestation of **Saṅkaraṇa**, named **Mahāviṣṇu**, always rests on the water of **Virajā** which is like an ocean extending over sixteen *Kṛōṣa*."

This **Virajā** has also been identified with a **Prakṛti** of **Kṛṣṇa** ³ ;—

In the **Āgama Grantha** it is said that **Kṛṣṇa** had innumerable **Prakṛitis** or **Śaktis**, among whom **Virajā** and **Rādhikā** were the chief. They had separate home. One day a **Prakṛiti** of **Virajā** went into the palace of **Rādhā**, and found **Kṛṣṇa** engaged in love amours with her. She told **Virajā** about this incident, who in grief melted into a river. **Kṛṣṇa** came and restored her to her own form. He then punished both **Rādhā** and **Virajā** for their jealousy with the curse that they should in one birth become other men's wives, as they are not satisfied by getting a husband like him.

Virajā is further identified as a daughter of the Sun :—

Virajā was born as a result of mental evolution of the Sun God. For this reason **Yamunā** is said to be the daughter of the Sun, for the **Yamunā** is the name of the molten **Virajā**. **Candrāvali**

¹ বিরজা নদীর পার মায়ার বসতি ।

² অক্ষয় সরোবরে পরমাত্মার স্থিতি ।
তাহা উথলিয়া বান পড়িলা নিশ্চিতি ॥

* * * * *
সেই বান-ঢেউ আসি বিরজা মিসাইল ।
বিরজার ঢেউ আসি রেবাতে পড়িল ॥

etc.

³ স্বকীয় রূপেতে আছিল গোলকে ।

* * * * *
শতকোটি শক্তি কৃষ্ণ একা বিলাসন ।

* * * * *
তার মধ্যে ছই শক্তি আছেয়ে প্রধান ।
রাধিকা বিরোজা বলি আছেয়ে আদ্বান ॥

is also the name of Virajā.¹

The points to be marked are :—

(a) Virajā is the daughter of the Sun.

(b) She flowed in the form of the Yamunā.

(c) Virajā was born as Candrāvalī owing to the curse of Kṛṣṇa.

Let us now see what records we have in the Sanskrit literature about this point.

The above story is thus narrated in the Bṛahma Vaivarta Purāṇa (Chapter XLIX) :—

“Once upon a time, Lord Kṛṣṇa, was sporting with a cowherdess named Virajā on a part of the Śata-Śrīṅga mountain situated in Vṛndāvana at Goloka..... Four female messengers of Rādhā went and informed her of the matter. Rādhā was, thereupon highly incensed, and she threw down the garland from her breast.Eulogised by her female attendants who were much afflicted at the sight of her wrath, she ascended with millions of her female companions, a chariot constructed with excellent gems.This car was faster in speed than the mind. Sudāma, the friend of Kṛṣṇa, as soon as he perceived the approach of Rādhā, warned Kṛṣṇa, and ran away with his associates. Afraid of forfeiting the love of his beloved Rādhā, Kṛṣṇa left the chaste Virajā and disappeared. Virajā, too, through Rādhā's fear, committed suicide. The female associates of Virajā, subdued by fear and grief, sought the protection of Virajā who began to flow in the Goloka in the form of a stream. Like a moat, this stream, one hundred crore-Yojanas in length and a crore Yojanas in breadth, encompassed the cow-world..... The female associates of Virajā were turned into rivulets. When Rādhā came to the place, and did not find Kṛṣṇa and Virajā, she returned to her own place.When Rādhā at last saw Kṛṣṇa, she rebuked him much. Sudāma, the friend of Kṛṣṇa, was annoyed at her reproaches, and admonished Rādhā. Rādhā was exasperated and said, “O crooked-minded Sudāma, quickly take the form of a crooked demon.” Sudāma also cursed her saying—“You will be born as a milk-maid, and descending from the Goloka to the earth below, you will suffer the intolerable torments of separation from Kṛṣṇa for a century.”

১ স্বর্গের মানস কন্যা বিরজা আপুনি ।
 তেঞি সে জমুনা বলি স্বর্গের নন্দিনী ॥
 বিরোজা দ্রবিত জেই জমুনা আখ্যান ।
 * * * * *
 বিরোজা তাহার নাম সেই চন্দ্রাবলী ।

The difference between the two stories is this :—The first story says that Kṛṣṇa was sporting with Rādhā, which was seen by a maid of Virajā who of her own accord melted in grief into a river. But the second story says that the Lord was sporting with Virajā, which was seen by the maids of Rādhā, and that Virajā out of fear for Rādhā, melted into a stream. In the first story, the curse was administered by Kṛṣṇa, but in the second, Rādhā and Sudāma cursed each other. But inspite of these differences, the stories on the whole bear a close resemblance. The main point is that there was a rivalry in love between Rādhā and Virajā, and that both of them were cursed to be born in the earth for their jealousy.

In the Third Act of the Caitanya Candrodaya Nāṭaka, the poet puts in the mouth of Nārada the following ¹ :—

“The place situated on the bank of the river Virajā, which is designated by us as the Parama-Vyoma Dhāma (*i.e.*, the highest aerial region), and where the earth, creepers and the groves are all ultra-physical (transcendental, divested of material elements, but types of refined spiritual productions), and which is full of birds and beasts, all immersed in endless joy, that place I now find symbolised in Vṛndāvana before me.”

Again in the Act V of the same work we have ² :—

“Who is the object of intense love of the son of Nanda, and who is nothing but Brahma melted into water, and who destroys the sins of all creatures and provides for their highest good, may that daughter of the Sun, named Yamunā, purify us all.”

N.B.—Here, undoubtedly, Yamunā is identified with Virajā. Both of them are said to be beloved of Kṛṣṇa, and both are the daughters of the Sun-God. It should be remembered here that the Āgama Grantha, as we have noted above, identifies Virajā with Yamunā and Caudrāvalī. But we shall have more about this matter later on.

In Chapter V of the celebrated work named Caitanya Caritā-mṛta we have the following description of this abode of bliss :—

¹ যৎপারে বিরজং বিরাজি পরমব্যোমেতি যদনীয়তে
 নিত্যং চিন্ময়ভূমি চিন্ময় লতা কুঞ্জাদিভিমঞ্জুলং
 সাক্ষাৎসন্দমহোদয়েঃ খগমুগ ব্রাতৈ ধৃতং সর্বতঃ
 তৎবৃন্দাবনমীকতে কিমপরং সম্ভাব্যমক্লেঃ ফলং ॥

² চিদানন্দভানোঃ সদানন্দসুনোঃ
 পরশ্ৰেয়পাত্রী অবব্রজগাত্রী ।
 অযানং নবিত্রী জগৎক্ষেমধাত্রী
 পবিত্রীক্রিয়ান্নো বপুমিত্রপুত্রী ॥

“ Beyond Prakriti (Māyā), there is a land called Paravyoma (Vaikuṇṭha) which is endless, all-pervading, and all-containing like the Lord Kṛṣṇa. It is the resting place of Kṛṣṇa, and of all His incarnations. Above this Vaikuṇṭha there is a place called Kṛṣṇa Loka (Abode of Kṛṣṇa) which is divided into three parts called Dwārakā, Mathurā and Gokula. Gokula is situated over the other two parts, and it is commonly known as Vraja Loka. It is also called Goloka, Śvetadvīpa or Vṛndāvana. This place is all-absorbing, endless, and all-pervading like the Kṛṣṇa Himself.

Those who attain complete emancipation cannot go to that abode (Vaikuṇṭha), but they reside in a place outside Vaikuṇṭha, where there is a luminous orb bright as the body of Kṛṣṇa. This is called Siddha Loka, and is situated beyond Prakriti (or Māyā).

Around this luminous orb is an eternal ocean which is called—*Kāraṇārṇava*.”

In support of this conception, the commentators have quoted the following verses :—

• Between Prakriti and Mahā-Vaikuṇṭha is the sacred river Virajā which is flowing in current of sweets issued from the Vedas.

প্রকৃতির পর পরব্যোম নামে ধাম ।
কৃষ্ণ বিগ্রহ বৈছে প্রভুত্বাদি গুণবান্ ॥
সর্বগ অনন্ত বিভূ বৈকুণ্ঠাদি ধাম ।
কৃষ্ণ কৃষ্ণ অবতারের তাঁহাই বিশ্রাম ॥
তাহার উপরিভাগে কৃষ্ণ-লোক খ্যাতি ।
ঘরকা মথুরা গোকুল ত্রিবিধে স্থিতি ॥
সর্বোপরি শ্রীগোকুল ব্রজলোকধাম ॥
শ্রীগোলক শ্বেতদ্বীপ বৃন্দাবন নাম ॥ etc.

আদি—৫ পরি :—১৩—১৬ শ্লোঃ ।

ব্রহ্ম শায়ক্য মুক্তের তাঁহা নাহি গতি ।
বৈকুণ্ঠ বাহিরে তা সবার হয় স্থিতি ॥
বৈকুণ্ঠ বাহিরে এক জ্যোতির্ময় মণ্ডল ।
কৃষ্ণের অঙ্গে প্রভা পরম উজ্জ্বল ॥
সিদ্ধ লোক নাম তার প্রকৃতির পার ।
চিৎ স্বরূপ তাঁহা নাহি চিচ্ছক্তি বিকার ॥

চৈতন্যচরিতামৃত—আদি—৫ম পরি :—২৮—৩০ শ্লোঃ ।

বৈকুণ্ঠ বাহিরে যেই জ্যোতির্ময় ধাম ।
তাহার বাহিরে হয় কারণার্ণব নাম ॥
বৈকুণ্ঠ বেঢ়িয়া এক আছে জলনিধি ।
অনন্ত অপার তার নাহিক অবধি ॥


চৈতন্যচরিতামৃত—আদি—৫পরি :—৪৫—৪৬ শ্লোকঃ ।

On the bank of this Virajā is the Mahā—Vaikuṇṭha which is ever-lasting, nectar-like, eternal and so forth.

The abode where the sun, moon and fire cannot enter, and going where one becomes free from rebirth, is called the highest ābode of the Lord Hari.¹

Again,—“The Siddha Loka where the emancipated and the demons killed by Hari live, is situated on the other side of Māyā.”²

The position of different Lokas according to this description is as follows :—



- ¹ প্রধান পরম ব্যোমোরস্তরে বিরজা নদী
বেদাঙ্গ স্বৈর্জনিত তোমৈঃ প্রেতাবিতা শুভা
তত্ত্বাঃ পারে পরব্যোম ত্রিপাভূতং সনাতনং
অমৃতং শাশ্বতং নিত্যমনন্তং পরমং পদং
শুদ্ধসঙ্কময়ং দিব্যমক্ষরং ব্রহ্মণঃ পদং
অনেককোটিসুখ্যামিতুল্য বর্চ সমবায়ং ।
* * * * *
নতস্তাসম্মতে সুখ্যো, ন শশাক্ষঃ ন পাবকঃ ।
যদগচ্ছা ন নিবর্ততে তচ্ছাম পরমং পদং । ভগবৎসন্দর্ভঃ—৩০ অঙ্ক ।

- ² সিদ্ধ লোকস্ত তমসঃ পারে যত্র বসন্তিহি ।
সিদ্ধা ব্রহ্মসুখে মগ্না দৈত্যাস্ত হরিণাহতাঃ ॥ ব্রহ্মাণ্ড-পুরাণ ।

Here বিরজা of ভগবৎ—সন্দর্ভ = তমসা of ব্রহ্মাণ্ড—পুরাণ ।


We now come to the evidence of the Chhândogya Upaniṣad. The Mantra VII (of Khanda XIII, Adhyāya III) gives an idea of the various Lokas or Heavens. The entire space is divided into three planes, (i) the Earthly Plane, (ii) the Astral Plane, (iii) the Deva Plane. Anantāsana is the heaven of the Earthly Plane, Śvetadvipa is the heaven of the Astral Plane, and Vaikuṇṭha is the heaven of the Deva plane. Three forms of the Lord resides in these three heavens,—Vāsudeva in the Anantāsana, Nārāyaṇa in the Śvetadvipa, and Vaikuṇṭha in the Vaikuṇṭha. (These are the three feet, or the Svarūpa or the essential form of the Lord.)

In the Mantra VI of Khanda XII, Adhyāya III, we have ত্রিপাদভাষ্যং দিবীতি, *i.e.*, “His immortal three quarters are in Heaven.” In the Mantra VII of Khanda XIII of the Adhyāya III, there are two phrases which mean “in the higher places than the Brahma-Loka” and “in places which are the highest.” The real meanings of these phrases have been explained by the commentator Mādhava in the following manner:—

“With regard to the Earth, the Brahmā’s world is in Meru. The Anantāsana is the highest Meru and so it is beyond the Brahmā’s world. With regard to the intermediate region, the Vaijayanta is the world of the Brahmā. The Śvetadvipa is beyond this, and so it is beyond the Brahmā’s world. With regard to the Dyū worlds, the Satya Loka is the world of Brahmā; and Vaikuṇṭha is beyond the Satya Loka, and therefore beyond Brahmā’s world.” (Allahabad Edition, p. 227.)

We have also seen that Anantāsana and Kṣira Sāgara are the parts of the Prakṛtic Plan.

The position of the three Lokas, according to this conception, thus becomes :—



Again, in the Mantra III of Khanda V of Adhāya VIII, we have :—

Āra and Nya are two lakes in the world of Brahman, in the third Heaven from hence (Meru). There is a lake where dwells the enrapturing Irā (Laksmi), there are the *asvattha* trees that shower the soma juice ; there is the city of the Lord called Aparājitā, and in it the throne built by the Lord, and called Prabhuvimitam, which is all golden."

It is further said—" In the world of the Supreme Brahman, in the highest region called the Śvetadvīpa, there are two lakes called Arā and Nyā, these divine lakes are full of sweet waters of knowledge and bliss." (*Chhāndogya Up.* All. Edition, p. 544).)

“ The White Island (Svetadvīpa) is situated in the ocean of milk.”

“ As much as the world of Indra called Svarga is high away from this world, so much higher than the world of Svarga is the Svetadvīpa (from the world of Svarga).”

“ In that Svetadvīpa is a tank full of wine and all sorts of eatables.”

“ The Svetadvīpa is the place where all must go in order to get their initiation from the Great Master.” (*Ibid*, pp. 544-45.)

In the Kauṣītaki Brahmaṇa Upaniṣad Chapter I, para. 3, we have :—

“ In the Brahma Loka there are the lake named Aira (consisting of evil passions), the mountains called Teṣṭihā (destroying the good), the river named Vījara (giving freedom from old age), the tree called Ilya (like the earth), the city named Sālaḥjyam (with high-banked reservoirs of water), the Council Chamber called the Bibhu (all-pervading), the throne named Vicakṣaṇa (full of wisdom), a conch named Amitaṇja (of infinite splendour), etc., etc.”

It is, thus, evident that :—

- (1) Svetadvīpa is the world of the Brahmaṇa.
- (2) It is surrounded by the ocean of milk.
- (3) There are two lakes, Arā and Nyā, Asvattha trees, a city called Sālaḥjyam, and a tank full of wine, etc.
- (4) There is also the river Vījarā.
- (5) It is the third heaven from Meru.
- (6) It is the place of initiation (after death).

Now, about Sahajapura. This seems to be the name of a place in the Svetadvīpa. The first point to be noted is that the Sahajīās identify Sahajapura with Sadānanda Grāma (সহজপুর সদানন্দ নামে সেই গ্রাম).

From the quotations given above we find that Svetadvīpa is also a place of Supreme Bliss.

In it there are lakes full of “ sweet waters of knowledge and bliss ” and it is situated in the ocean of milk. It is also “ full of wines and all sorts of eatables.” It contains Asvattha trees that shower soma juice. The idea of a more blissful place cannot be conceived.

Secondly, the Sahajīās say that their ever-blissful Sahajapura is situated on the bank of the river Virajā (বিরজা নদীর পার সেই দেশ খান).

We have seen that in the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, Virajā is the name of a river flowing in Goloka. In the Bhagavad Sandarḥya

also Virajā is the name of a celestial river. In the Caitanya-Candrodaya Nāṭaka and in the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, the river Virajā has also been similarly treated with. In the Kauṣītaki Brahmana Upaniṣad also Vijaṛā is the name of a river in the Brahma Loka. It will thus appear quite clear that the Sahajīās were indebted to the earlier Sanskrit literature for the conception of a blissful land on the bank of the river Virajā.

Thirdly. It is said that the sun and moon do not dare to shine in Sahajapura.¹ In the Bhagavad-Sandarva also the ideal Heaven is said to be a place where the sun, moon and fire cannot enter.² In this respect, therefore, these two places seem to be almost identical. In the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, as we have seen above, Siddha Loka is said to be a luminous orb bright as the body of Kṛṣṇa.³

From all these considerations Sahajapura seems to be a place situated in the Svetadvīpa, which is the Heaven of bliss of the Vaiṣṇavas.

This Svetadvīpa is always associated with the Ekāntina Vaiṣṇava faith. In the Nārāyaṇīya Section of the Sāntiparvan we have a description of how Nārada went to Svetadvīpa to know the secrets of the mystic religion for knowing Kṛṣṇa. We shall here quote from the observations of the eminent scholar like Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar in his celebrated work named Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism.

সূর্য্য নাহি চলে বেদ নাহি বলে

পবনের নাহি গতি ।

না চলে চন্দ্র নাশয়ে ধনু

কিবা সে স্থানের জ্যোতি ॥

অমৃতরসাবলী ।

চন্দ্র সূর্য্যোদয় নাই না চলে পবন । etc.

অমৃতরসাবলী ।

¹ ন তদ্ভাসয়তে সূর্য্যো ন শশাঙ্কঃ ন পাবকঃ । etc.

ভগবৎসঙ্কর্ভ ।

² বৈকুণ্ঠ বাহিরে এক জ্যোতির্শ্রয় মণ্ডল ।

কৃষ্ণের অঙ্গ প্রভা পরম উজ্জ্বল ॥

আদি—৫১২৯

“Nārada is represented to have gone to the Badarikāśrama to see Nara and Nārāyaṇa. The latter was engaged in the performance of religious rites. Nārada asked Nārāyaṇa whom he worshipped, while he himself was the Supreme Lord. Nārāyaṇa told him that he worshipped his original Prakṛti, the source of all that is and that is to be.”¹ Then Nārada, advised by Nārāyaṇa, went to Svetadvipa. “He (did) praise the great being by uttering names expressive of his purity and grandeur and the great being then manifested himself to him; saying that he was not to be seen by one who was not solely devoted to him.” (Page 6.)

Again, Ekata, Dvita and Trita, sons of Prajāpati are said to have narrated—“On one occasion we went to the north for the attainment of *eternal bliss* near the *milky ocean* and practised austerities for four thousand years, and at the end a voice in the air declared—“Well, how can you see that great Lord! In the milky ocean there is a white island where there are men possessing the lustre of the moon, who are the devotees of the god, ...and being devoted solely to the god...are absorbed in him who is *bright like the sun*” (pp. 5-6).²

Again, “the heaven of this Nārāyaṇa” was Svetadvipa or white island. In the Kathāsaritsāgara (54-19; 21; 23) Naravāhanadatta is represented to have been carried away to the white island by Devasiddhi and to Hari reposing on the body of the serpent Śeṣa and attended by Nārada and other devotees. In another place in the same work (115, 101-3) certain gods are spoken of as having gone to Svetadvipa and seen Hari in a house made of great gems, lying on the serpent-bed, with Lakṣmi sitting at his feet. In the Harivaṃsa (14. 384) it is stated that Yogins and Kāpilasāṃkhyaś who desire Mokṣa or final deliverance, go to the white island or Svetadvipa, by reciting the prayer

¹ This idea of Nārāyaṇa worshipping a higher deity has also been copied by the Sahajīās:—

কত শত জন কৈল বহু শ্রম
কেহও যাইতে নারে ।
শিব হলধর সে নহে গোচর
গোলোক নাথ ভাবে যারে ॥
অমৃতরসাবলী ।

² The conception of milky ocean and of eternal bliss is to be specially marked. Sadānanda Desa, and Kṣīra Samudra are perhaps the products of such conceptions.

and praise composed by Balin. Evidently, therefore, Svetaadvīpa or white island is the heaven in which Nārāyaṇa, spoken of sometimes as Hari, dwells. It corresponds to the Vaikuṇṭha of Viṣṇu, the Kailāsa of Śiva, and the Goloka of Gopāla Kṛṣṇa; and to that heaven of Nārāyaṇa it was that Nārada went and saw him and learned from him the monotheistic religion of Vāsudeva. (Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar's *Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism*, p. 32.) (These stories are narrated in the Mahābhārata, Śāntiparvaṃ, Sections 335-41.)

It should be observed that the Vaiṣṇava works like the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, Caitanya-Candrodaya Nāṭaka, Amṛtarasāvalī, Amṛtaratnāvalī and others have spoken of this Svetaadvīpa as the highest heaven where the worshippers of Kṛṣṇa can go. Even the Chhāndogya Upaniṣad, as we have pointed out before, speaks of Svetaadvīpa as the highest heaven of the Astral Plane where lives Nārāyaṇa. It will thus be quite clear that the authors of all these works worked on the same principle in locating the heaven of Nārāyaṇa. The Sahajīās have not coined anything new in this respect but have followed in the footsteps of the earlier Vaiṣṇava writers to whom they are undoubtedly indebted for this conception.

SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE.

The ever-blissful land is said to be situated on the bank of the river Virajā. Now, Virajā means without attachment, as used in the Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad l. 4. 23, where it is one of the qualities of the Supreme Lord. Even an emancipated person, by becoming one with God, can become Virajā, i.e., without attachment. This attachment is the cause of the bondage of man in this world. So that one who is without attachment, is surely the person who is liberated. Even the Sahajīās seem to have worked on this principle. In the Nigudhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, as I have noted before, it is said that Māyā lives on the bank of the river Virajā.

Undoubtedly, this Māyā is the cause of attachment, and so, if one can cross over Virajā where lives Māyā, one can become free from attachment. In the description of the Caitanya-Candrodaya Nāṭaka, which we have quoted above, the place on the bank of the river Virajā is said to have earth, creepers, and groves, all ultra-physical (transcendental, divested of material elements, but types of refined spiritual productions). This is, therefore, the place which is free from the grossness of any kind. Attachment (bondage) of the world cannot, therefore, cross the boundary of this place. We thus find that

the Sahajīā conception of a blissful land on Virajā is based upon sound spiritual theory. In Act V of the same work, as we have quoted above, Yamunā which is another name of Virajā, is said to be nothing but Brahma melted into water. In the storied of Virajā also the river is said to be a most dearly loved companion of Kṛṣṇa. Everywhere we find Virajā associated with sanctity, and it destroys the sins of all creatures and provides for their highest good.

In the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, as we have quoted above, the blissful land is said to be on the remote side of the Prakṛti, i.e., beyond the sphere of the Prākṛta plane. It is, therefore, without attachment; for union with Prakṛti is the cause of creation, and so of the bondage of the world. In the Bhagavad-Sandarbhā, as we have quoted above, the sacred river Virajā is said to be situated between Prakṛti and Mahā Vaikuṇṭha which is a place free from rebirth. Now, none but the liberated is free from rebirth, so it follows that one who can cross over Virajā, which is the limit of Prakṛti or attachment, can reach the land of the immortal. Even in the Chhāndogya Upaniṣad Vaikuṇṭha which is the heaven of the Deva Plane is said to be beyond the Prākṛtic Plane which extends up to the limit of the Astral Plane. From all these authorities it is perfectly clear that Virajā is the limit of attachment, and hence the crossing of Virajā has the spiritual significance of going beyond the sphere of attachment. This can alone be attained by the emancipated. So the conception of Virajā is based upon spiritual significance.

N.B.—The word Vījarā of the Kauṣītaki Brahmana Upaniṣad does not materially alter the sense. It means freedom from old age, which can only be attained by those who are far advanced in spirituality. When a man is born he is bound to be old, but to become free from old age is to conquer birth, which is only possible for the liberated ones.

THE IDEA OF PERPETUAL BLISS.

Sahajapura, according to the Sahajīās, is a land of eternal bliss. Now perpetual joy means complete freedom from sorrow. In the first Sūtra of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy it is said—"The permanent cessation of (the three kinds of) pains is the supreme purpose of life," so, it follows that when a man can attain to this stage of spiritual perfection he can no longer be afflicted with sorrows of any kind, and hence can enjoy perpetual joy. Even in

the conception of God, unqualified joy has been made one of the three attributes (Sat, Cit, Ānanda) of the Supreme Being, and it is a common belief that when a man realises God, he passes into the state of eternal bliss. "The knower of Him becomes free from grief by the grace of God" (Kāṭha Up., 2.20). Again, "The wise leaves behind worldly joy and sorrow, having realised that Supreme Being" (*ibid*, 2-12). "He who knows the highest Brahmanā becomes great. He crosses over grief and sin, breaks the fetters of his heart, and becomes immortal" (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, 3.2.9). "He who knows the Self overcomes sorrow" (Chhāndogya Up. 7.1.3). "Just as a disc (of gold and silver), covered with dust, shines full of lustre when it is well-washed, in the same way, man, having thoroughly realised the reality of the Spirit, and being one with God, becomes free from sorrow, and attains his desired object" (Svetāśvatara Up., 2.14). Quotations of this nature can be multiplied at ease. It is, therefore, evident that perpetual bliss can only be enjoyed by those who are liberated. The idea of Sadānanda Desa is based upon this conception. In this respect the Sahajīā cult manifests a prominent characteristic of the Mokṣa Dharma. The enjoyment of constant bliss in heaven is the object of both.

APPENDIX A.

AMṚTARASĀVALĪ.

[HEREIN WE AIM AT SHOWING THE NATURE OF A TYPICAL
SAHAJIA BOOK.]

It is a well-known fact that the Sahajīās in their religious books often make use of what is known as the Sandhyā Bhāṣā, *i.e.*, language couched in words of obscure meaning. In this respect they have adopted the method generally employed by the Tantrics in writing their religious tenets. Among the earlier Sahajīā writers Caṇḍīdāsa did this in a conspicuous degree, and his Rāgātmikā Padas are all written in that language. But there is still another method which also found favour with the later Sahajīā writers. It is the expression of the higher philosophical truth of the religion in a metaphorical way in which the real meaning always lies hidden under the garb of the most commonplace expressions. Among the post-Caitanya Sahajīā writers Mukunda Deva Goswāmī is specially noted for using this method, and his Amṛtarasāvalī, which is, undoubtedly, a most important Sahajīā book, is entirely written in this way. The subject is there treated in such an excellent manner that the book ranks as one of the most important contributions to the Bengali theological literature. A careful study of this book alone will surely command respect for the religion which now suffers from popular misapprehension and neglect. We shall now try to give a brief summary of this book in this place.

The story is this : There was a lotus pond under the care of one called Sarvadevā who appointed five archers to guard it. He had also a band of nine followers under the leadership of one called Savā. One night, this Savā and his nine lieutenants went to steal the essence of the lotus in the pond. He was there made a captive by the archers, but his nine associates turned back. Sarvadevā one day came to them and called for Savā, but on being informed that he was lost, he ordered the nine followers to find out Savā on pain of death. They searched for him but without success, and at last they became Sannyāsis on the bank of a river for fear of Sarvadevā. One day a beautiful girl came to bathe in the river, when she captivated the hearts of all the nine Sannyāsis. One among them

of the grant is said to be, “Māyāvādi-manogarva-bhedine,” i.e., “one who breaks the pride of mind of those who maintain the doctrine of illusion.”¹

It is thus evident that Sahajīās, like the earlier advocates of Vaiṣṇavism, had the necessity of refuting the theory of Śaṅkarācārya for the purpose of establishing their own creed.

Then to come to the story itself :—

এক সরোবর পৃথিবী ভিতর
কমল ফুটিল তায় ।
ফুলের রসে সরোবর ভাসে
দুধার বহিয়া যায় ॥
লজ্জা নিবারণ করে যেইজন
তাহার অংশের অংশ ।
সেই কিছু পায় আর বহি যায়
বরণ যেমন হংস ॥

or

“In a pond in this world there bloomed a lotus. The essence of the flower filled the tank and overflowed both the banks. The part of the part of one who prevents shame gets something, but the rest flows in a stream white as swan.” The meaning of this passage will be quite clear from a reference to the following extracts from Candīdās

ডুবিল রসের সরোবরে ।
সেই সরোবরে গিয়া মনপদ্ম প্রকাশিয়া
হংস প্রায় হইয়া রহিব ॥

and

কাম আর মদন দুই প্রকৃতি পুরুষ ।
তাহার পিতার পিতা সহজ বাহুব ॥

So, this Sarovara is the pond of Rasa or love and the lotus stands for mind. The part of the part (grandchild) of one who prevents shame is Kāmadeva or the God of love, who is the son of Kṛṣṇa and who again is the son of the chief God of the Sahajīās who is here identified with the Vaiṣṇava conception of Mahāviṣṇu from whom Kṛṣṇa himself is said to have originated. It is undoubtedly

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, p. 5.

admitted by philosophers that this worldly love is merely a shadow of divine love, and this is metaphorically expressed in the above passage.

সেই ফুল সেই রস সেই সরোবর ।
সর্বদেবতার আশা করে নিরন্তর ॥
যেই মাত্র সরোবরে কমল ফুল ফোটে ।
সর্বদেবা তথা গিয়া ফুলের রস লোটে ॥
সরোবরে পঞ্চ জনা রক্ষক রাখিয়া ।
ফুলের রস যোগা তোর। সাবধান হৈয়া ॥
এত বলি সর্বদেবা গেল আপন স্থানে ।

or,

The lotus, the Rasa, and the pond all long for Sarvadevā, who tastes the essence as soon as the flower blooms. He appointed five guards who were ordered to protect this essence, and then he went to his own abode.

Now, who are the Sarvadevā and the five guards? Sarvadevā is Paramātmā or Supreme Soul¹ and the five guards are the five elements, i.e., earth, air, fire, water and sky, which, according to the Hindu idea, compose the human body.²

So the truth stripped of the allegory is simply this.—This human body of ours is composed of five fine elements. It contains the mind which in its highest perfection manifests love of God. This divine love is to some extent akin to the worldly love. Herein we find how God can be realised through love—a very pet theory which is the foundation of the Bhakti cult of the Vaiṣṇavas and of the Sahajias in particular.

Now the main story begins thus :—

রসছোঁরা একজন সভা নাম তার ।
নয়জন তার মধ্যে তিঁহ সে সঙ্গার ॥
একদিন চুরি কর্তে করিল গমন ।

¹ সর্বদেবা পরমাত্মা কল্প-মোহন ।

নগুঢ়ার্ধ-প্রকাশাবলী ।

অসতত সন্তোষ সর্বস্ত প্রভাবাব্যয়ঃ ।

সর্বস্ত সর্বদা জ্ঞানং সর্বমেতৎ প্রচক্ষতে ॥

বিকুপুরণ ।

সর্বদা ও সর্ব বিখ্যাত প্রত্যেকরূপে সকল ব্যাপিরা আছেন বলিয়া শিব । তিনি সমুদয় কার্যকারণের মূলীকৃত ও সর্বজ্ঞ বলিয়া তাঁহার নাম সর্ব ।

মহাকীর্ত ।

² পঞ্চভূত পঞ্চজন দেহ ইথে হয় ।

বিশুঢ়ার্ধ-প্রকাশাবলী ।

or

“Savā was at the head of nine followers who one day went to steal (the essence of the lotus pond).” Now, who are this Savā and his nine lieutenants? Here, Savā represents the human soul or Jivātmā,¹ and his nine followers are the nine senses.² That the individual soul, releasing itself from the keeping of the Supreme Soul, went to enjoy the essence of the lotus lake, when he

¹ In Nigudhārthaprakāśāvalī (নিগূঢ়ার্থ-প্রকাশাবলী) the allegory is explained in the following way :—

সর্বদেবার অঙ্গে হৈল সভার জনম ।
সভার অঙ্গেতে মোরা হৈলাম নয়জন ॥
... ..
এই নয়জন মোরা হই যে সভার ।
সভা সহ কাব্য করি সর্বদেবার ॥

i.e.,

Savā was born from Sarvadevā, and the nine followers were born from Savā, but all the ten were doing the work of Sarvadevā. In the Gītā, we have

মমৈবাংশে জীবলোকে জীবভূতঃ সনাতনঃ ।

Chapter XV, Śloka VII.

i.e.,

The individual soul is a part of mine in this world.

Again--

সর্বশু চাহং হৃদি সমিধিষ্টঃ

Chapter XV, Śloka XV.

i.e.,

I enter the created beings in the form of Jivātmā, etc., etc.

In the Rāmānuja system, we have—“The individual soul and the insensate world are the attributes of the Supreme Soul. They constitute his body and thus they, with the controlling inward Supreme Soul, constitute one entity called Brahman.”—Dr. Bhandarkar's Vaiṣṇavism.

The relation between the individual soul and the Supreme Soul is also discussed in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (I. 10).

The derivation of the word Indriya also points out the relation between Jivātmā and the senses.

ইন্দ্রিয়= [ইন্দ্ৰ (আত্মা, স্বরূপ) + ইন্দ্ৰ] অর্থাৎ আত্মা বাহ্যর উপর প্রভুত্ব করে। (জানেন) ।

² The nine followers are the nine senses, of which five are outer senses, otherwise called the organs of perception, i.e., eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin; but the other four are the inner senses, otherwise called the organs of consciousness, i.e., mind, egoism, intelligence and heart. That the nine followers are to be interpreted in this way is also supported by a subsequent passage of the text itself. When Savā was forsaken by his nine followers, he is said to have been free from the evil influences of two kinds, one inward or mental, and the other outer or physical.

“বাহু ও মনের আত্মার দুই দূরে গেল ।”

was caught within the clutches of the five elements, figuratively illustrates the truth advocated by the earlier Vaiṣṇava saints to the effect that the creation begins at the desire of enjoyment experienced by the Supreme God who is then born in the form of individual soul and develops in the form of the existing universe. The individual soul, which, before creation, remains wholly submerged in the Supreme Soul, separates itself as soon as the Supreme One feels the desire of enjoyment. From this desire truly begins the creation, which the saint Śaṅkarācārjya calls illusion, but the Vaiṣṇavas accept as a means of tasting divine love.

Then, when the soul thus became a captive within the confines of the human body, it passed through a process of evolution.

তাহাকে ছাড়িয়া দিল আপনার গুণে ।

মিছামিছি বন্দি আছে আপনা না জানে ॥

কত যুগ বহি গেল নাহিক চেতন ।

ছায়াক্রমে মারা পিষাচ করয়ে দণ্ডন ॥

নিত্যানন্দ চাঁদ যবে উদয় করিল ।

বাহু ও মনের আঁকার ছই দূরে গেল ॥

He released himself through his own exertions. So long he unnecessarily remained a captive, only for want of self-consciousness. Ages went past in this state, and he suffered the oppression of the demon Māyā or illusion. When the ever-joyful moon (of consciousness) arose (in his mind) he got clear of darkness (ignorance), both inner and outer.

The brief summary of this is that a man remains in a state of captivity, so long as the spiritual consciousness does not arise in his mind, and in this condition he falls a prey to the evil influences of desire, but when true knowledge dawns upon him, his captivity ceases and he becomes free. This philosophical truth is expressed by the allegory of the captivity of Savā and his spiritual emancipation. When he, however, succeeded in making himself free from the bondage, he went to train the senses that had forsaken him. But let us see in what condition they were after they had left Savā.

আর নয় জন গৃহে করিল গমন ।
 ভয় পাঞা গৃহে থাকে না যায় দেবদ্বান ॥

 হেনই সময়ে তথা আইল সৰ্বদেবা ॥
 সভা সভা বলি তিহ ডাকিতে লাগিল ।
 নয়জন গলকজ্জ বাহির হইল ॥

 তারা কহে হারারেছি সভা যে সৰ্দার ॥
 তিহ কহে তারে তোরা খোওয়ারিহি কোথা ।

 সভার বিহনে আমি জীয়েন্তে মর ।
 মোর প্রাণ রক্ষা কর সভা আন তোরা ॥

 না আনিলে গোষ্ঠীসহ করিব সংহারে ।

The nine others went to their abode, and kept themselves confined in the house for fear (of Sarvadevā) to whom they did not go (to inform him about the captivity of Savā). At this time Sarvadevā came there and called for Savā. The nine followers came out of their hiding place with cloth round their neck (by way of submission) and told him about the loss of Savā. He told them that he was as if dead for want of Savā and requested them to find him out and save his life. They were also threatened with death if they failed to do so.

So, the nine senses began to search for Savā or Jivātmā under the command of Sarvadevā or Paramātmā. That the Supreme God conducts men in the path of religion, is an idea which is referred to in the Hindu religious books, and which has now become a pet theory with the devoted people.¹ Moreover, the anxiety of Sarvadevā for Savā is here quite significant. It

¹ ভেবাং সততযুক্তানাং ভক্ততাং শ্রীতিপূর্বকম্ ।

দদামি বুদ্ধিবোগং তং যেন মামুপবাশ্তি তে ।

ভেবামেবানুকম্পার্থমহমজানজং তমঃ ।

নাশদাম্যাক্রতাবহো জ্ঞানদীপেন ভাবতা ।

Gītā, Chapter X, Ślokas, 10, 11.

In Śloka XXXII of the same Chapter, Kṛiṣṇa says that He is অধ্যাত্মবিদ্যা বিদ্যানাং ।

Also মৌনং চৈবান্মি গুহ্যানাং জ্ঞানং জ্ঞানবতামহম্ ।

Gītā, Chapter X, Śloka XXXVIII.

In Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (III. 2. 3) and in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (II. 23) there are verses to the effect that God is to be attained by him whom the Supreme Soul favours.

Dr. Bhandarkar's Vaiṣṇavism.

describes the relation of Jivātmā with Paramātmā,¹ which has been so beautifully discussed in the Upaniṣads. Jivātmā is dependent upon Paramātmā for its existence, but the Paramātmā, on the other hand, is also dependent upon Jivātmā, for the latter is the only medium through which the former can act.

Then the nine senses searched for Savā for a long time, but without success. At last they became Sannyāsīs on the bank of a river.² The description of this river shows that it is nothing but what is called the Dharma Nadi or the current of religion.

নদীর উপরে পৰ্ব্বত বেড়ি গেছে ।
 পৰ্ব্বতের পূৰ্ব্ভাগে দহ পড়িরাছে ॥
 তাহার নিকটে বহুশূন্য দ্রব্য হয় ।
 ডুবিতে পারিলে তাহে অবশ্র মিলয় ।
 নদী মধ্যে বালি নাই পক যে সকলি ।
 ছই ধারে হয় তার পৰ্ব্বত সম বালি ॥
 কত শত সদাগর নৌকা বাহে তার ।
 নদী আলো করিরাছে নৌকার সজ্জায় ॥
 কুলবতী কত শত স্নান করে তার ।
 নদীর পরশে তাদের রূপ বাড়ি যায় ॥
 ধন প্রাপ্তি লাগি কেহ দহে দেয় ঝাঁপ ।
 ধন প্রাপ্তি নাহি হয় ঘটে এসে পাণ ॥

¹ জীবর পরমাত্মা, তাহার প্রতিবিম্বিত পদার্থ জীবাত্মা । জীবাত্মা দেহের অভ্যন্তরস্থ স্বচ্ছ পদার্থ, যাহাতে পরমাত্মা প্রতিবিম্বিত হন । আত্মরূপ উজ্জ্বল কোবই সৰ্বব্যাপী পরমব্রহ্মের পরমস্থান ।

উপনিষৎ—ব্রাহ্মসম্মত ।

So the existence of God can only be felt through Jivātmā which is also called another Prakṛiti of God and which supports this world.

অপরেরমিতত্ত্বনাং প্রকৃতিং বিদ্ধি মে পরাম্ ।
 জীবভূতাং মহাবাহো যয়েনং ধার্যতে জগৎ ॥

Gītā, Chap. VII, Śloka. 5.

² অনেক খুজিল তার লাগ না পাইল ।
 তবে মিলি বুদ্ধি করি তপসী হইল ।

or,

A mountain encircles the river, and in front of the mountain there is a deep bay which holds valuable articles available only to those who know how to dive. In the slopes of the river on either side, there are hillocks of sand, but the bed of the river contains nothing but mud. Merchants trade on the river on boats which look beautiful. Chaste women have their charm enhanced when they bathe in the river. Some people jump into the bay for wealth, but they get only sin instead.

Here the mountain and sands represent the difficulties that overtake a traveller on the path of religion. The metaphor of merchants suggests the fact that there are people in this world who trade on religion. Those who adopt religion for the sake of wealth, or feign to be pious for mercenary motive, become beset with sin. Herein we have a picture of various religious activities.

Then one day a beautiful girl came to bathe in the river. Her beauty captivated the hearts of the nine ascetics, one of whom followed her. He swooned on the way by looking back, but the girl came to him and revived him with her own energy.¹ He was then taken to her abode and given shelter.

The girl here represents love and the one who followed her is mind.² But there is one peculiarity in this pursuit. By looking behind, the man swooned on the way. This swoon represents one special characteristic of love advocated by the Sahajīās. A devotee should sacrifice everything for love. He should rise above the limitations of society and disregard public opinion in the pursuit of love. But if he hesitates for any of these considerations, he is a dead man so far as the spiritual love is concerned. "Looking behind" means that in the pursuit of love, the man hesitated in his course owing to the clamour of the world, but finally the call of love triumphed. This is to be understood by the allegory as to how he

^১ একদিন এক কস্তা নদী স্নান কৈল ।
তার রূপ নয় জনার হৃদয়ে পসিল ।
একজন পেল আর আট জনা থাকে ।

* * *
রাগে ২ কস্তা জার পশ্চাতে সে জন ।
পাছু পানে চাইবা মাত্র হইল মরণ ।
কস্তা নিকটে আসি বহু বহু কৈল ।
আপনার শক্তি দিয়া তারে বাচাইল ।

^২ কস্তা সঙ্গে মন পেল তাহাই করিল ।

দ্বিগুণার্থ-প্রকাশাবলী ।

swooned and then revived. This is also supported by other passages of the text, and Caṇḍīdāsa also expresses the same view.¹

The remaining eight senses remained on the bank of the river as before. After some time, Savā came to them in the disguise of a human being and asked them the reason of their asceticism.

তিহ কহেন তুমরা স্বরণ কর কারে ।
কোন দেব পূজা কর এই নদি তিরে ॥
* * *
ইহার তিরে তপস্তা করিলে কিবা হয় ॥
* * *
তারা কহে ইহা যোরা কিছুই না জানি ।
তেহ কহেন তোমরা যদি তত্ত্ব নাহি জানি ।
ঘরদ্বার ত্যাগিঞ বনের ভিতর কেন ॥
তারা কহে তপস্তার নাহি জানি তত্ত্ব ।
* * *
তপস্বীর বেসে য়াছি সৰ্বদেবার ডরে ॥

i.e.,

He asked them who was the object of their meditation and what god they were worshipping on the bank of that river. They answered that they knew nothing of the kind. He said that if they did not know the reason, why then were they living in the wood forsaking their home. They answered that they were doing so for fear of Sarvadevā.

This conversation reveals an important chapter of the Sahajiā doctrine. The performance of idol worship and sacrifices and the observance of asceticism have underlying them the fear of God, which induces men to undergo all sorts of austerities in order to escape punishment. But the Sahajiās, on the other hand, take to love for spiritual emancipation. This love is a natural tendency

চিনিলে যদি ধরি পারে ।
জীবন থাকিতে তখন মরে ॥
পুন সে বাচয়ে কাহার গুণে ।
বাহার হয়্যাছে সেই সে জানে ॥
And অগত বাচিলে আমি সে মরি ।
অমৃত রসাবলী ।
তাঁহার মরণ জানে কোন জন
কেনন মরণ সেই ।
বে জনা জানয়ে সেই সে জীবয়ে
মরণ বাটয়া লেই ।
চণ্ডীদাস ।
ভুনি আর আমি মাঝে কেহ নাই
কোন বাধা নাই ভুবনে ।
রবীন্দ্রনাথ ।

of the mind and it is bereft of all fears. They thus condemn the religion of fear or at least call it a very crude form of religion. It is for this reason that they say,

বিধি পথ পরিত্যজ রাগানুগা হয়ে ভজ,
রাগ নৈলে মিলে না সে ধন ।
 প্রেমানন্দ-লহরী ।

and

ছাড়ি জপতপ করহ আরোপ
একতা করিয়া মনে ।
চণ্ডীদাস ।

i.e.,

leave the course laid down by the Śāstras and follow the way of love.

In this view of matters, the Sahajiyās exactly preach the same tenets as the Vaiṣṇavas.

•The Savâ revealed himself to the eight ascetics, three of whom went to Sarvadevâ to inform him about the return of Savâ. He came and requested Savâ to return to his keeping, but he refused to go. Thereupon he went away with the three ascetics, while the other five remained with Savâ.¹

The three Sannyāsis who went with Sarvadevā are the three remaining inner senses, namely, heart (ह्रिद्), egoism, and intelligence. Of the four inner senses, mind had gone with the girl (love personified), now the rest were taken by Sarvadevā. The significance of this statement becomes quite clear when we remember that, according to the Vaiṣṇava conception, God has a wonderful self-multiplying power, which is called his Vaibhāvavilāsa. By this He divided Himself into four Vyūhas, of which Pradyumna is

১. এত শুনি পাঁচ জন। তাহাতে জানিল ।

* * *

তবে তিন জনা গেল সর্বদেবার ঠাক্রি ।
প্রণাম করিয়া কহে শুনহ গোমাঞি ॥
নরবপু বেশে সভা আছে নদীতীরে ।

সর্বদেব আসি অনেক যতন করিল ।
কদাচিত্ত তার সঙ্গে সভা নাহি গেল ॥
আপনা পাসরি দেব করিল পছান ।
তিন জন সঙ্গে লঞা গেল আপন স্থান ॥

আর পাঁচ জন। সভার সম্মুখে বহিল।

identified with mind corresponding to the Sāṃkhya Buddhi or intelligence, and Aniruddha with egoism or consciousness. In the Caitanya Caritāmṛta there is a clear and elaborate description of this religious speculation. But this Vaibhāvavilāsa is quite different from the Mādhuryavilāsa which he adopted in Vrajadhāma and which found its full manifestation in Caitanyadeva. As the Sahajiyās are the followers of this Mādhuryavilāsa, it is quite natural that they should ignore the necessity of intelligence, mind and egoism for the realisation of God, which is more the work of the brain than of the heart. The entire speculations of the Upaniṣads are of this class and it is well-known that they have complicated the matter to a great extent. But the Sahajiyās follow what they call the path of love, which makes the approach to God easier. It is for this reason that they do not rely on the work of intelligence.

The five ascetics who remain with Savā are the five organs of perception, namely, eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin. Savā now undertook the training of these senses. For,

যথা আছে সেই কল্পা তিহ তাহা জানে ।
 যাইতে না পারে তথা সঙ্গে পঞ্চ জনে ॥
 নির্জিকার না হইলে যাইতে না পারে ।
 বিকার থাকিতে গেলে যাবা মাত্র মরে ॥
 তিহ হন নির্জিকার তাঁর বিকার নাই ।
 পাঁচ জনা সঙ্গে রহে তেঞি নাহি যাই ॥
 পঞ্চজনে কোথক দিনে করিল সমান ।
 পাঁচ জনার এক বাক্য একই পরান ॥

i.e.,

He (Savā) knows the place where the girl lives, but he cannot go there as he has the five senses with him. No one can go there without being free from the evil tendencies, otherwise he meets with death. The soul is by nature immutable, but he is associated with five senses, and therefore he cannot go. Within a few days he gave to them a status equal to him in every respect, so that they became one in mind and speech.

That the soul is immutable is a well-known Vedantic theory, the echo of which is found in these passages. In the Gītā we find that the Jivātmā is always associated with five senses and does not forsake them even when it leaves the human body, but carries them with it when it enters a new form.¹

¹ Chapter XV, Slokas 8, 9.

The training of these senses is an essential condition for advancement on spiritual path, which is also clearly set forth in the Gītā.¹ The first work of Savā was devoted to this task, and when this was effected, he was then fit for journey towards the spiritual goal.

The girl again came to bathe in the river, but this time she was followed by all the six. On the way they hesitated to advance, whereupon the girl went alone to her house and sent the first captive, whom she had taken long before, to conduct the six Sannyāsīs to her.² He came by following a zigzag course and when they met, the following conversation took place between them :—

ভরত কহেন তোমরা থাক কোন দেশে ।

তারি কহে আমরা সব তীর্থ করি বুলি ।

এ দেশের যত তীর্থ দেখিব সকলি ॥

ভরত কহে এই দেশে কিছু তীর্থ নাই ।

রহক তীর্থের কার্য আচরণ নাই ॥

কার্য নাই আমাদের আচারে বিচারে ।

লুকাইতে আদিয়াছি সর্বদেবার ডরে ॥

এই বাক্য শুনি ভরত শীঘ্র চলি গেল ।

i.e.,

Bharata asked them where they had come from, and they replied that they were out on an errand to visit the sacred places and meant to

¹ যদা সংহরতে চায়ং কুর্মোহজ্ঞানীব সর্বশঃ ।

ইন্দ্রিয়ানীন্দ্রিয়ার্থেভাস্তত্ত্ব প্রজ্ঞা প্রতিষ্ঠিতাঃ ॥

তানি সর্বাণি সংযম্য যুক্ত আসীত মৎপরঃ ।

বশে হি যন্তেন্দ্রিয়ানি তত্ত্ব প্রজ্ঞা প্রতিষ্ঠিতাঃ ॥

2/58,61.

নির্বিষ্কার না হইলে নহে প্রমোদয় ।

অমৃত-রস্মাবলী ।

² সেই কথা নদী নান আইল করিতে ।

হয় জন পিছে ২ ঘান কিছু দূরে ॥

তাহারাও দাড়াইয়া রহিল তথাই ।

শীঘ্র করি আইলা তঁহ আপন ভবনে ।

ভরতে ডাকিয়া কহে শুনহ বচনে ।

যত্ন করি তা সবারে আনিহ আপনে ॥

বীক পথে চলে যেতে দেখিলা হয় জনে

see all the Tirthas that country held. Bharata said that there were no sacred places in that country, besides, the people there did not observe prescribed custom. They said that they had nothing to do with custom, they had simply come to hide themselves for fear of Sarvadēvā. When he heard this, Bharata made a quick return.

Then the girl came to them and asked them where Bharata was. They said that they were no respectors of castes and custom themselves, but as Bharata was a man who did so, he could not reasonably have anything to do with them.¹

Bharata is here said to be a follower of zigzag course. It is not the easy path adopted by the Sahajiyās, but a circuitous way as chalked out by the rules of the Śāstras, which is later on called the way of Sadācāra. This Sadācāra means the time-honoured custom observed in India according to the prescribed rules of Manu and Purāṇa.² Though Bharata had become a convert to the Bhakti cult, yet he adhered to the time-honoured custom, and hence he could not become a true Sahajiyā. That he still fled for fear of Sarvadēvā shows that he was even then under the influence of conventions and prejudices common to the people.

What then followed is very important. Bharata did not return to the abode of the girl, but went to a forest where he wrote Āgama-sāra, a religious book dealing with the doctrines of Siva and Pārvatī.³ This shows as if the Bhakti cult, which the Sahajiyās follow,

¹ লৈতে এলো যে কোথা গেথ সে
কহে মোরা নাহি জানি ।

* * *

মোরা জাতি ছার তিহ সদাচার
কেন দিবে দরশনে ॥

² আগমেষু পুরাণেষু সংহিতাস্থ যথোদিতান্ ।
সমুদ্ভিষ্ট-সদাচারান্তান্ গৃহীয়াদ্ গৃহস্থবৎ ॥
কালিকা-পুরাণ, ৮৬ অঃ ।

তস্মিন্ দেশে (ব্রহ্মাবর্তে) য আচারঃ পারম্পর্যাক্রমাগতঃ ।
বর্ণনানং সাস্ত্ররালানং সদাচার স উচ্যতে ॥
মহু ২।১৭—১৮ ।

³ সেই দেশ পার হইয়া গেল অস্ত্র দেশ ।
দুর্গম বনের মধ্যে করিলা প্রবেশ ॥
আপনার তত্ত্ব তিহ লেখেন আপনে ।
আগমসার গ্রন্থের মঙ্গলাচরণে ॥

* * *

শিবদুর্গার বাক্য লঞা কর্যাছি বর্ণন ।

bears resemblance to the religious principle of a sect of the Śaivas, with this difference that the latter, while professing the way of love, still bind themselves with the duties of castes and the rules prescribed by the Śāstras, but the Sahajiyās entirely disregard these practices. This is a very important suggestion as to the comparative study of the two religions, which further research will clear up.

The six ascetics were then taken to her abode by the girl and admitted into the paradise of the Sahajiyās.

N.B.—In the Vaiṣṇava Scriptures, the Vaidhi and the Rāgānugā also form a subject of speculation—and a far greater stress is given on the latter as the best means of reaching the ultimate goal of the soul. These theories and speculations might have been introduced by the Sahajiyās into their cult from the Vaiṣṇava Scriptures, or the Vaiṣṇavas might have adopted them from the Sahajiyā principles which were current in the country from an ancient time. It is, however, clear that the Sahajiyās, though professing equality in social ranks, do not venture to violate the conventional distribution of castes, but when they meet under their Guru in their nocturnal meetings, they throw away their mask altogether and absolutely discard all caste-considerations. This is implied by their familiar tenet

লোকের মধ্যে লোকাচার—

গুরুর কাছে একাকার ।

APPENDIX B.

SAHAJIYĀ LITERATURE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. 1. RATNASĀRA. University manuscript No. 1111. Substance, Country-made paper, 14 × 5 inches in size. Folia, 191. Lines 9 in a page. Character, Bengali. Date of script, 1267 B. S. corresponding to 1860 A. D.

2. Author, Kṛṣṇadāsa who describes himself as the follower of Rupa and Raghu Nāth.¹ It is doubtful whether he is the same person who wrote the celebrated Caitanya Caritāmṛta in 1615 A. D., though he asserts, in many places in this book, that he wrote the Caitanya Caritāmṛta.²

3. The book is divided into twenty chapters, all written in Payāra Verses. The author has thus summarised the book by narrating the subject treated in each chapter :—

I have written the book Ratnasāra in twenty chapters. In the First Chapter I have treated about the subject of Rāga (intense love), in the Second I have dealt with the two theories of Āropa, (i) spiritual culture in mind, (ii) spiritual culture in body. In the Third I have localised the whole universe in the different parts of the human body. The Fourth Chapter deals with Prema (love), while the Fifth about the secrets of the human body. The Sixth deals with mind and the Seventh about Campaka. The Eighth explains fifteen Ślokas (of Bhāgavata about the love of Rādhā) while the Ninth deals with the ordinary and spiritual meaning of the love of Rādhā. The Tenth deals with Rāga or love, and the Eleventh explains seventeen Ślokas (of Caitanya Caritāmṛta

¹ শ্রীরূপ রঘুনাথ পদে জার আস।

রত্নসার রত্নগ্রন্থ কহে কৃষ্ণদাস ॥

Page 191.

² শ্রীচৈতন্য চরিতামৃতে লিখিআছি ভালমতে।

শ্রীসনাতন উক্তি শ্রীভাগবতে ॥ তথাহি। চরিতামৃতে—

কাম প্রেম দুহাকার স্বরূপ বিলক্ষণ। ইত্যাদি। ইত্যাদি

Also—ইহা স্পষ্ট লিখিআছি শ্রীচরিতামৃতে। Page 4.

dealing with the incarnation of Caitanya). The Chapters Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and the Fifteenth deal with the four stages of Caitanya's life. The Sixteenth explains the significance of the three alphabets forming the word Sahaja, the Seventeenth deals with the fate of ordinary man in this world while the Eighteenth about the teachings of Sanātana. The Nineteenth deals with the theory of total destruction, while the Twentieth about natural religion."¹

Chapter I. Rāga is said to be superior to Bhakti. The idea that God is all-powerful and infinitely superior to man, fills the mind with Bhakti, but not with love which can alone bind soul to soul. When Kṛṣṇa desired to know how deeply he was loved by Rādhā, he incarnated himself in Caitanya Deva and showed to the world how God is to be loved with the passion of a woman. This is called Rāga, the culture of which is advocated by the Sahajiyās.

Chapter II. Āropa or spiritual culture in the company of woman. This can be done either by training the senses in the company of women as was done by Vidyāpati, Caṇḍī Dāsa, Joydeva and others, or by training the faculties of mind as was demonstrated by Narahari Dāsā of Śrīkhaṇḍa.

Chapter III. All the objects of the world are localised in human body, the fire in the stomach, air in the nose, the oceans in the head, throat, breast etc., fourteen worlds in the arms, feet etc. etc, and so forth.

Chapter IV. About Prema. It points out the difference between Kāma and Prema. Kāma is like iron, while Prema is gold. It further deals with Sāmānya, Sādhārāṇī and Samarthā Ratis. These ideas have been borrowed from books like Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Bhakti-rasāmṛta-Sindhu, etc.

Chapter V. It deals with the spiritual significance of Asthi, Sandhi, Bindu, etc., the psycho-physical elements which make up the human body.

- ¹ বিংশতি অধ্যায় লিখিলাম গ্রন্থ রত্নসার ।
 প্রথম অধ্যায় রাগতত্ত্ব বিচার ॥
 রাগতত্ত্ব প্রেমতত্ত্ব প্রথমে কহিল ।
 আরপের দুই মত—বিতীঅ দেখিল ॥
 বর্তমান দেহভাণ্ড—ব্রহ্মাণ্ড স্থাপন ।
 তৃতীয়ে লিখিল তাহা হুয় ভক্তগণ ॥
 চতুর্থে লিখিল প্রেমতত্ত্বের প্রকাশ ।
 পঞ্চমে কহিক তত্ত্ব কহিল নির্জাস ॥
 মন সিন্ধু ॥ সপ্তমে লিখিল ব্যাক্য করি ।
 সপ্তমে চম্পক তত্ত্ব রস অনুসারি ॥

etc., etc.

Chapter VI deals with mind. It discards* Vaidhi Bhakti,† and advocates Rāgānugā, speaks about the organs of senses, and describes Paramātmā.

Chapter VII deals with the origin of Campaka which is identified with Rādhā representing the highest emotion of joy, which is an attribute of God-head.

Chapter VIII explains fifteen Slokas of Bhāgavata dealing with the love of Rādhā.

Chapter IX explains the ordinary and spiritual meaning of the love of Rādhā maintaining that it is the symbol of Rāgānugā love.

Chapter X deals with Rāga under various classifications, such as, Sakhi Rāga, Parama Sakhi Rāga, Puṇḍra Sakhi Rāga, etc., etc.

Chapters XI—XV deal with the incarnations of Caitanya and his life following the authority of the Vaiṣṇava works, like Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Bhāgavata, etc., etc.

Chapter XVI says that Sahaja means heavenly pleasure, and incidentally deals with the three stages of Prabarta, Sādhaka and the Siddha. The Prabarta stage begins with the initiation, followed by the Sādhaka-stage in which the devotee works under the guidance of the Gurn, the Siddha stage begins when he gets spiritual insight.

Chapter XVII deals with the punishments that are inflicted upon man for his evil acts, and says that the recitation of the name of Hari is the only way to salvation.

Chapter XVIII points out the inferiority of Vaidhi Bhakti in the form of a discussion between Sanātana and Rupa.

Chapter XIX first describes the process of creation, and then of destruction and re-creation in the form of a dialogue between Sanātana and Rupa. It has followed the Paurāṇik theory in this matter.

Chapter XX deals with natural love. There are three kinds of love, *i.e.*, ordinary, lustful and real. The first two do not last long, while the third, which is deep love, becomes identified with the nature of the lovers and it never dies.

* The Vaidhi Bhakti is that Spiritual devotion which grows gradually in the human mind by following the canons laid down in Scriptures.

† The Rāgānugā absolutely discards all rules and canons of the Śāstras and follows its own course impelled by the ardour of love.

Note.—The author seems to have been influenced by the writings of earlier poets, for, at the end of each Chapter he writes something like—“ This second chapter of Ratnasāra is the translation of Āropa Tattva of Rasārṇava.”¹

II. 1. **Āgama Grantha.** University Manuscript No. 1144. Substance, country-made paper, 14×5 inches in size. Folia, 10. Lines, 10 on a page. Character, Bengali. Date of script, 1075 B.S. corresponding to 1668 A. D. The verses are Payāra throughout. The book is not divided into different chapters.

2. Author. The name of the author is not given. In the colophon the author simply describes himself as “ বৃন্দের দাস ”, i.e., the humble worshipper of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. It is doubtful whether this can be taken to mean Jugala Dās, and a name thus ascribed to the unknown author.

3. The book is written in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and Pārvati. They were seated on the mountain of Kailāsa when Pārvati asked Śiva about the worship of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. Śiva said that Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa should not be considered as possessed of two different bodies. In fact the two in union form an undivided whole, and cannot be separated. The whole universe was produced from them. Śiva said that he himself was a worshipper of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.

Then Pārvati asked, “ If Rādhā Kṛṣṇa is Puṇa Brahma, then what is the reason that the people worship various gods instead of taking shelter in Kṛṣṇa alone.”

Śiva said that he was responsible for this. He was instructed by Hari to preach various doctrines by speaking ill of Him (Hari). He did this, and thus grew different religions, the followers of which must go to hell. In this way the superiority of the Vaiṣṇava religion over all other faiths was established.

Then follow discussions about the love amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in Vrindābana, about the reason of various incarnations of Kṛṣṇa in different ages, about the birth of Rādhā and Virajā, on account of a quarrel among them, in the forms of Rādhā and Candrāvalī in Vrindābana, about the incarnation of Caitanya with the body of Rādhā and the soul of Kṛṣṇa.

Notes.—In page IV of this book, Pārvati is said to belong to the Sahajiyā section of the human beings, and in page VI, there is

¹ রত্নসার রসার্ণব তত্ত্বানুসারে আরপত্ত অমুবাদ বিষয় একবর্ণ কথা বিতিঅ অধ্যায়

a discussion about Svakiyā and Parakiyā in defence of the character of Rādhā.

III. 1. **Amritarasāvalī**. University Manuscript No. 577. Substance, country-made paper, 12×5 inches in size. Folia 16. Lines 9 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated, only the date of the month is given and not the year of composition. It was written on the 17th day of Bhādra. The verses are generally Payāra, but Tripadī has also been used in some places.

2. Author. The book was not actually written by Mukunda Dāsa, as has been noted in the Viswa Kosha, Vol. XXI, page 349. The following history of composition, as given by the author, seems to show that the book was written by a disciple of Mukunda Dāsa under his instruction :—

“When Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj Goswāmi was requested to write a book (perhaps about Caitanya) he refused on the ground that he was incompetent. Thereupon Nitāi consoled him and said that he would write the book under inspiration from Caitanya Deva. So he wrote the book (most probably, Caritāmrita) as he was made to write under divine inspiration. While writing this book, he got the scent of the Sahajiyā doctrine. He was very eager to write about Sahajiyā, but he was prevented by Nitāi to do so. Then he touched upon Sahajiyā in the Bhaktikalpalatikā, while in the Caitanya Caritāmrita he gave but a brief allegorical summary of the doctrine. In Premaratnāvalī he was going to give a clearer exposition to this religion, but he swooned, when he dreamt that Nitāi came to him and gave him permission to write about the Sahajiyā. He was afterwards fortunate in getting the permission of Rupa Goswāmi also. Rupa learnt the doctrine from Caitanya and taught it to Raghunāth Dāsa, who advised Mukunda Deva to write about it. Mukunda wrote a book and gave it to me, but as I could not understand it, I returned it to him. Thereupon, he rendered it into easy Payāra, and caused the book to be written by giving the pen in my hand.”¹

¹ কবিরাজ গোস্বামিকে যবে প্রভু রূপা কৈল ।

গ্রন্থ বর্ণন কর তাহাকে কহিল ।

গোস্বামি কহেন যুক্তি করি নিবেদন ।

মোর শক্তি এই গ্রন্থ না যায় বর্ণন ।

নিতাই কহেন তুমি ভরসা কর মনে ।

চৈতন্য লিখাবেন তোরে আসিলা আপনে ।

This shows that the disciple wrote under inspiration from his Guru Mukunda Deva. The following couplet confirms this belief :—

“Mukunda Goswāmi said, ‘I am telling you about the Sahajiyā doctrine, you should write by way of annotations.’¹ This shows that Mukunda Deva was giving instruction in the form of Ślokas, which were explained by his disciple in this book.”

Again in the invocations of this book we find “I bow down to Mukunda who dispelled my doubts, etc.”²

It looks odd to think that Mukunda bowed down to himself, and we are, therefore, of opinion that the book was written by one of his disciples under his instructions.

Note.—The Sahajiyās are very eager to prove that Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj, Raghunath Dās, Rupa and other noted Vaiṣṇavas were Sahajiyās. We are, therefore, of opinion that in the history of composition of this book as noted above, an attempt has been made by the author to trace the smell of Sahajiyā doctrine in the writings of these pious Vaiṣṇavas. It is doubtful whether they actually wrote about the subject.

3. The whole book is written in the form of an interesting allegory. Sarvadeva was the owner of a lotus pond which he guarded by five archers. Savā was at the head of a band of nine other thieves, and they all went to steal in the pond. There Savā was made a captive while the nine others fled. They searched for Savā, but could not find him. At last they became Sannyāsis on the bank of a river. One day a girl of exquisite beauty came there, and she was followed by one of the nine thieves. He swooned on the way, but was revived by the girl who took him to her house. In the meantime Savā got free and came to his companions waiting

তার মধ্যে এক বস্তু পাইল সার ।
 প্রকাশ করিতে বাহ্যি হইল তাহার ॥
 * * * * *
 ভক্তিকল্পলতিকাতে দেখি বিচার করা ।
 সহজ ভাঙ্গিতে এতু কলম নিল করা ॥
 চৈতন্যচরিতামৃত সহজ সংক্ষেপে লিখিল ।
 * * * * *

প্রেমরত্নাবলীতে সহজ ভাঙ্গিতে ।
 অচৈতন্য হয়। তিঁহ পরিল বুঝিতে ॥ etc., etc.

¹ গোষ্ঠাক্ষি মুকুন্দ বলে সহজ বস্তু বলি ।

স্নোকার্ণ ভাঙ্গিয়া দিয়া লেখহ লকলি ॥ p. 8.

² বল গোষ্ঠাক্ষি মুকুন্দ বাহ্যি হৈতে গেল দক্ষ । etc., etc.

on the river bank. When they recognised him, five of them went to Sarvadeva to inform him about the arrival of Savā. He came to Savā and requested him to go to his keeping* but he refused. Thereupon, Sarvadeva went away with the three thieves, while the remaining five began to live with Savā who trained them. The woman again came to bathe in the river and was followed by all the six. They reached her house and were admitted into the inner apartments after proper test and training.

Note.—The story is a philosophical one. Sarvadeva represents Paramātmā or the Supreme God, while Savā stands for Jivātmā or human soul. The nine thieves are the nine senses of which five are outer, *i.e.*, organs of work, while the remaining three are inner, *i.e.*, the organs of mind. The girl represents love who in turn captivated the ten thieves. The whole story is an allegory to explain the struggles of human soul to be united with the Supreme Soul or God through love. In the story the author clearly points out that nothing can be got by austerities until the senses are trained, and divine love takes possession of the soul. (See App. A.)

The book incidentally refers to the Tantric doctrine. The first thief who followed the girl is said to have written his own history in Āgamasāra which was composed in the form of a dialogue between Siva and Durgā.¹

IV. 1. **Amritaratnāvalī.** University Manuscript No. 595. Substance, country-made paper, $11\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, 2-13. Lines, 12 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1206 B. S. corresponding to 1799 A. D. The verses are generally Payāra, but Tripadī has also been used in some places. See App. A.

2. Author. Authorship is attributed to Mukunda Dāsa, who, as we have seen in the Amritarasāvalī, was a disciple of Raghunāth Dāsa Goswāmi who was a contemporary of Caitanya, Rupa and Sanātana. He was a noted Sahajiyā writer, and the authorship of Siddhānta Çandrodaya, Deha Nirṇaya, Çamatkāra Çandrikā, and a few others, is attributed to him.

¹ আপনার তত্ত্ব তি'হ লিখেন আপনে ।
 আগমসার গ্রন্থের মঙ্গলাচরণে ॥
 তার তত্ত্ব শুনিতে যদি কার লোভ হয় ।
 আগমসার দেখিলে পাবে তাহার নির্ণয় ॥
 শিবদুর্গার বাক্য লঞা কর্যাছি বর্ণন ।
 অজ্ঞাবধি সেই বাক্য ঈত্তর লোকে কন ॥

3. The book chiefly deals with a description of various ponds and lotuses in the psycho-physiological plane of the human body. It begins with a discussion of Rasa, Rati and Rupa, and shows how they are interrelated. Then we find how a worshipper should pass through the different stages of spiritual culture. At first he should be initiated before a Guru and act according to his advice. This is called the preliminary stage. He should then practise with the *mantras* he receives from his Guru at the time of initiation, and also perform various pious acts according to the dictates of the Guru. Asakti will thus grow in his mind, which will gradually lead to Rāga, and Prema. Then the author lays stress upon the knowledge of human body, without which, he asserts, nothing can be performed in the sphere of mystic culture. There are four corners of the body guarded by four deer. There are also four ponds in the body, namely, Kāma, Māna, Prema and Akṣaya. Paramātmā or the Supreme Soul lives in the Akṣaya pond on a thousand petalled lotus which is situated in the inverted position. This idea has been taken from the Tantras where the Akṣaya pond is spoken of as the Sahasrāra Cakra. According to the author, the mystic practices should begin from the Kāma pond which is situated in the lower part of the body. Here lives Jivātmā, i.e., human soul. The object of mystic practices is to effect an union of Jivātmā with the Supreme Soul which lives in the Akṣaya pond over the head.

V. 1. **Deha Nirṇaya.** University Manuscript No. 613. Substance, country-made paper, 11×5 inches in size. Folia, 16. Lines, 11 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1259 B. S. corresponding to 1852 A. D. The verses are Payāra throughout with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

2. Author. The name of the author is not given, but thus far it can be known that he is the follower of Kasturi Manjari who is one of the twelve Sakhis of Rādhā. It was the custom of the Sahajiyās to adopt one of these Sakhis as their spiritual guide, and the author in this book speaks about himself in no other term than that he is the follower of the Sakhi Kasturi Manjari.¹

3. The author speaks about the superiority of the Parakiyā mode of worship over the Svakiyā system. By following the latter

¹ কস্তুরি মঞ্জরি পাদপদ্ম করি ধ্যান।

সংক্ষেপে কহিল এই দেহের আক্ষ্যান ॥

one goes to Goloka, while a follower of the former goes to everlasting Vrindāvana which is said to be much above the Goloka. It should be noted that the Parakiyā mode of worship is the pet theory with the Sahajiyās and hence they support it with arguments. The author then deals with the psycho-physiology of the human body. Here again comes the theory of ponds. According to the author of this book, Māna pond is situated at the middle part of the body from where two legs originate. Labanga Manjari was born in this pond. The two legs are like two stems of the lotus-like feet. Then comes the Middle ponds at the navel. It is the seat of the five kinds of airs, called Prāṇa, Apāna, Vyāna, Samāna and Udāna. They live in five houses which have only one door where there is an elephant representing dark ignorance. Then comes the hundred-petalled lotus at the heart wherein is situated the Kṣīra pond. Then there is a lotus in the throat, and one in the mouth where there are both honey and poison. The author is indebted to the Tantras for these ideas. The ponds have been located mostly in the places of the Tantric Cakras. Then follows a subtle description about 24 ghāṭa, seven islands, seven oceans, etc., etc., in the human body. These are the things of abnormal physiology, and we have no choice but to take them as they are described.

VI. (a) **Upāsana Pāṭala**. University Manuscript No. 557. Substance, country-made paper, 14×5 inches in size. Folia, eight. Lines, eleven in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1069 B. S. corresponding to 1662 A. D. The verses are Payāra through-out with occasional quotations of Sanskrit couplets from various Vaiṣṇava works.

(b) Narottama Dāsa is the author of the book. In the colophon he puts himself as the friend of Rāmachandra Kavirāj.¹

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ সত্যঃ । নমামী শ্রীগৌরচন্দ্রঃ নিত্যানন্দং তৎপরং । অদ্বৈত ত্রীবাঙ্গাং
গৌরভক্তগণাং স্তুত্বা । প্রণমহ গুরুদেব-শ্রীপদকমল । জার ক্রিপা গেলে হয় কৃষ্ণ-
প্রাপ্তি খন ॥ এমন গুরুর পায় সদা করি ধ্যান । কৃপার ইন্দ্ৰিতে খণ্ডে সকল অজ্ঞান ।

¹ রামচন্দ্র কবিরাজ মৌর মৌকর্নাস ।

উপাসনাতত্ত্ব কহেন নরোত্তম দাস ॥

The end :—

নমস্ত গুরবেতুভ্যং কৃষ্ণায় বৈষ্ণবায় চ ।

দদীতি জিপায়ান্ত্রৈ কৃষ্ণপ্রাপ্তি বিধানক ।

ইতি সন ১০৩৯ সাল তারিখ ২১ বৈশাখ : লিখিতঃ শ্রীনারায়ণদাস বৈষ্ণব সাং পরমানন্দপুর পঠক শ্রীনারায়ণদাস বৈষ্ণব সাং বাঘাপাড়া । শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ-চরণ প্রসিদ্ধ ।

(d) The book deals with the subject of worship, as the name of the work signifies. The poet begins by identifying Caitanya and his companions with Kṛṣṇa and his associates. Thus Baladev is said to have been incarnated in Nityānanda, Kṛṣṇa in Caitanya Deva and so forth. In dealing with the amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, the poet puts up a nice description on the basis of Sahajiyā ideal :—

সহজ রসের সিদ্ধ সহজ চাতুরী ।
সহজতাদ্বৈতমর্শ সহজ মাধুরি ॥
বিধির মাধুরি সব জাহাতে নিলয় ।
অবধি মাধুরি রস স্নেহ আশ্বাদয় ॥

* * *

সহজ কৈসর বয় সহজ লাবণ্য ।
সহজ ললিতরূপ সহজ জৌবন ॥
সহজ অঙ্গের ভঙ্গি সহজ রঞ্জিয়া ।
সহজ ভ্রুসন অঙ্গে কি দিব উপমা ॥

Then the poet laments that the evil passions have kept him in the darkness of ignorance. The selfish motive Kāma should be given up and works should be done by giving up all desires. This is the mode of worship by which God can be attained.

VII. (a) *Guruśiṣya Saṁvāda Upāsanā Tattva*. University Manuscript No. 558. Substance, country-made paper, $13\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, six. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1069 B. S. corresponding to 1662 A. D. The verses are Payāra throughout with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The author of the book is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself as a disciple of Lokanāth Dāsa :—

শ্রীলোকনাথ ঠাকুর চরন বরন অভিলাস ।

গুরু দিগ্ধ সবাদ কছেন নরোত্তম দাস ॥

(*) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ সত্যঃ ।

নমোঃ নির্ণয় সাধ্যং বহু সাধনানি

কুর্বন্তি বিজ্ঞা পরমাদরেন ।

শ্রীকৃপাদাজ্বরজ্যোতিসেকং

ব্রতঞ্চমেতৎ সম সাধনানি ॥

এই মত গুরু সিন্ধে দুহে এক ঠাঞি । প্রেমোত্তর সৃষ্টি করে আনন্দিত হই ।
শিশু নিবেদন করে শ্রীগুরু গোসাঞি । সনিয়ম জে করিলে শ্রীদাস গোসাঞি ॥

The end :—

শ্রীলোকনাথ ঠাকুর চরন স্বরন অভিশাশ ।

গুরু শিশু সন্যাস কহেন নরোত্তম দাস ॥

ইতি শ্রীগুরু-শিশু সন্যাস উপাসনা-তত্ত্ব নিরূপনং নাম দশম পটল সম্পূর্ণ ॥ লিখিতঃ
শ্রীনায়ক দাস বৈষ্ণব সাং পরমানন্দপুর ভিতরজাত পং বিষ্ণুপুর পঠক শ্রীনায়ক
দাস বৈষ্ণব সাং বৈষ্ণবতল বাগ্যাপাড়া । ইতি সন ১০৬৯ সাল তারিখ ১৩ বৈশাখ
শ্রীশ্রীশ্যামচান্দ জা করেন । শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ চরন প্রসিদ । শ্রীশ্রীশ্যামচন্দ্রায় নমোনম ॥

(d) The book has been written in the form of dialogues between a Guru and his disciple. The subject dealt with is about worship and the object of worship. This problem is solved by asserting that Kṛṣṇa as born in Vrindāvana should be worshipped with love as was done by Rādhā and her companions.

VIII (a) Svarupa Varnana. University manuscript No. 559. Substance, country-made paper, 13×4½ inches in size. Folia, seven. Lines, eleven in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1071 B. S. corresponding to 1664 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The author of the book is Kṛṣṇa Dāsa who bows to the feet of Rūpa and Raghunāth.

শ্রীকৃপ রঘুনাথ পদে জার আশ ।

স্বরূপ বর্ণন কিছু কহে কৃষ্ণদাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণঃ । স্বরূপ বর্ণ লিখিতে । জয় জয় গৌরচন্দ্র জয় নিত্যানন্দঃ । শ্রীঅষ্টৈত
চন্দ্র (জ)য় গৌরভক্তবৃন্দ ॥ শ্রীঅষ্টৈতার্ঘ্যগন স্নান হঞা এক মন । গৌরচন্দ্র অবতার
হৈল জে কারন ॥

The end :—

শ্রীকৃপ রঘুনাথ পদে জার আশ ।

স্বরূপ বর্ণন কিছু কহে কৃষ্ণদাস ॥

ইতি সন্ন্যাস বর্ণন গ্রন্থ সংপূর্ণ। এ পুস্তক জ্ঞানাদিষ্ট তথা লিখিতঃ। লিখোকো দোষনাসকং। ভীমস্বাপি রনে ভক্ত মনিনাক্ষ যতিভ্রমঃ। এ পুস্তক লিখিতঃ শ্রীগৌর চরন দত্ত—সাক্ষী কতুলপুর পাঠকার্ণে শ্রী.....সন ১০৭১ সাল ভাং ১৭ আশ্বিন।

(d) The whole book is devoted to the identification of the companions of Rādhā with the associates of Caitanya Deva. Towards the end there is a discussion about Parakiyā holding Rupa Goswāmi responsible for the propagation of the idea :—

শ্রীরূপ ব্রজনিলা করিলা বিস্তার।

পরকীয়া যত তাহা করিলা প্রচার ॥

IX. (a) *Guṇātamikā*. University manuscript No. 560. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 4½ inches in size. Folia, four. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1072 B. S., corresponding to 1666 A. D. The book is written in prose throughout.

(b) The name of the author is not mentioned in the book.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ। শ্রীগণিতা জিউঃ গোবিন্দোচনা বর্ণঃ মউরপুচ্ছ তুল্য বঙ্গঃ তাণ্ডুল সেবা কোতুক কুঞ্জঃ বয়েশ তের বৎসর সাত মাস দশ দিন। শ্রীবিশাখা জিউঃ বিদ্যাত বর্ণঃ তারাবলি বঙ্গঃ ইত্যাদি।

The end :—

সিদ্ধ দেহে সখির আশ্রয়। আশ্রিত দেহ রাগের আশ্রয়। আপনে সাধন সিদ্ধা সখি। সাধন সেবা। প্রবর্ত দেহ ভজনে দেহ। প্রবর্ত দেহে গুরুর আশ্রয়। সেবক সেবক সখক। ভজনে বন্ধুসম সখক। সাধকে সখি সখক। ইতি গুণাত্মিকা সমাপ্তঃ ॥

ইতি সন ১০৭২ সাল তারিখ ১৫ ফাল্গুন রোজ বুধবার শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ চরন প্রসাদাং।

(d) This book also deals with the descriptions of the companions of Rādhā, as will be evident from the quotations from the beginning of the book noted above, the development of various emotions, and their classifications are also treated in details.

N. B.—There is another *Guṇātamikā* manuscript in the University marked with the serial No. 600. The colophon of that book states—

গুণাত্মিকা কহে এই রামচন্দ্র দাশ।

The subjects treated in these two books are not identical.

(Vide section xli below.)

X (a) *Caṇḍīdāser Caitya Rupa Prāpti*. University manuscript No. 561. Substance, country-made paper, 13 × 4½ inches in size. Folia, three. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is

dated 1081 B.S. correspondig to 1675 A. D. The book is written in prose throughout.

(b) The name of the author cannot be ascertained with certainty.

At first sight the name of the book suggests that Caṇḍīdāsa is the author of the work, but on close examination of the contents of the book grave doubts creep into the mind. If Caṇḍīdāsa had been the author, -he could not have spoken about himself in terms as “চৈইত রূপা চণ্ডিদাস মহাসঅ” (p 3). We do therefore conclude that the name of the book itself is “শ্রীচণ্ডিদাসের চৈত রূপা প্রাপ্তি”, but this does not mean that Caṇḍīdāsa is the author of the treatise. At the end of the book we have “লিখতঃ শ্রীগদাধর নিজ পাপি”. Nothing can be said definitely about the sense conveyed by word “লিখিতঃ”.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণঃ চৈতন্তদেব। চৈইত রূপা-প্রাপ্ত আসক্ত বিলাস। চৈইত রূপার।
রা। চ। অধ রূপ লাড়ি। রা যক্ষরে রাগ লাড়ি। চ অক্ষরে চেতন লাড়ি।
রাএতে চ মিসিল। রাএতে র মিল। ইবে এক অক্ষা লাড়ি; etc.

The end :—

পুন রতি চারি। কেকে। নেত্র ১। নাসা ২। সিন্দূরের বিন্দু ৩। অধো
অধর ৪। এই চারি রতি মহা মহা রাগ লাড়িতে বসে। ই শ্রীচণ্ডিদাস ঠাকুরের
চৈই রূপা প্রাপ্তি সম্পূর্ণ। লিখিতঃ শ্রীগদাধর নিজ পাপি। সন ১০৮১ সাল।

(d) The book is written in mystic language. The whole discourse is based upon the technical interpretations of the terms.

(X1) (a) *Rādhārasakārikā*. University manuscript No. 562 Substance, country-made paper, 14 × 5 inches in size. Folia, five Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1081 B. S. corresponding to 1675 A. D. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The author is Narottama Dāsa. In the colophon he puts himself as

শ্রীলোকনাথ গোস্বামির পাদপঙ্ক্ত করি আস
রাধারসকারিকা কহে শ্রীনরোত্তম দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

ও শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণঃ। রাধারসকারিকা।
অহো গুরুনাং গরিমা-গরিমানয়ংপাদ পদার গ্রাদি গুরুবো ভবন্তি।
গঙ্গাস্তমাং প্রেমমখোদকানিগঙ্গোদদাক্ষত্রবং ভবন্তি। ইতি।
জয় ২ শ্রীচৈতন্ত জয় নিত্যানন্দ। জয়ধৈতচজ জয় গৌরভক্তবৃন্দ ॥ etc.

The end :—

ইতি রাধারসকারিকা সমাপ্তঃ। ইত্যাদি। ইতি সন ১০৮১ সাল তারিখ ৩০ কার্তিক। শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ চরনে শ্রবনং। শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণচৈতন্য চন্দ্রায় নমোনমঃ। লিখিতং শ্রীনারায়ণ দাস বৈষ্ণব সাং পরমানন্দপুর। পঠক শ্রীকানাক্ষি মণ্ডল একাদশ তিলি সাং ললবনিগ্রায় ॥

(d) The God Kṛṣṇā can be realised by worshipping him by adopting any of the five kinds of emotions, such as Sāntā, Dāsyā, Sakhyā, Vātsalyā and Madhura. Of these Madhura is the best. It falls into two kinds, namely, Svakiyā and Parakiyā, of which latter is the recognised emotion of Vṛndāvana. It is difficult to realise God in intellect. He should, therefore, be regarded as a person, born in this world in the form of a human being courting our love. This is the Sahajiyā theory of spiritual culture, which is said to be the easiest means of realising God in person.

XII. (a) *Upāsanāpaṭala*. University Manuscript No. 563. Substance, country-made paper, 13×4 inches in size. Folia, eight. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1087 B.S. corresponding to 1681 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

তোমা সভার পদরজ চিত্তে অভিলাস।
উপাসনা পটল কহে শ্রীনরোত্তম দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণঃ। উপাসনা পটল। শ্রীচৈতন্য প্রভু বন্দে শ্রীকৃষ্ণ শ্রীসনাতনং।
তব পাদরঞ্জে মহং দদাস্তি কৃপায়ানিধে ॥ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য প্রভু রূপ সনাতন। কৃপা
করি দেহ মোরে তৎপাদ সেবন ॥ সাধা সাধন তব বৃন্দিতে না পারি। বহু গ্রন্থ
বহু শাস্ত্র নির্ধারিতে নারি।

The end :—

ইতি শ্রীউপাসনা পটল সমাপ্তাশ্রায়ং। শ্রীশ্রীরাধা কৃষ্ণ চরণভোজ্য নমোনমঃ।
শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণদেবচরণভোজ্য নমোনমঃ। শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণচরণভোজ্য নমোনমঃ। ইত্যাদিঃ।
ইতি সন ১০৮৭ সাল তাং ১০ কার্তিক রোজ বৃষবার তিথি শুক্ল পক্ষে সপ্তমি দিন।
লিখিতং শ্রীনারায়ণ দাস বৈষ্ণব সাং বাধাপাড়া তং বৃন্দিল পুং বিষ্ণুপুর। সরকার
মল্লভূম ॥

(d) To worship Kṛṣṇa, one must be the disciple of a good Guru. If a man performs austerities in a former birth on the banks of the Ganges, he can have his mind purified, but if he serves the

sages like Prahlāda, Nārada and Sukha in previous birth he can be born as a Vaiṣṇava. To realise God, mind should be purified and God should be approached through Bhakti. But Vaidhi Bhakti (which means bhakti followed according to the dictates of the Śāstras) does not lead to the purity of mind, while that of Rāgānugā (love) can easily find out the desired object. To be accustomed to this sort of love one must be initiated before a Guru. He should then pass through various stages of life and ultimately attain Siddhi or the final stage of perfection. This is the mode of spiritual culture.

N.B.—We have already dealt with another book (*vide* section VI, U. M. No. 557) which is also called Upāsānāpāṭala. Though the title and the author is the same, these two books differ in the treatment of the subject of spiritual culture. The former simply speaks of purity of mind as the means of attaining the highest stage of perfection, but says nothing as to how the mind can be purified. This has been done in the book under review in this section.

XIII. (a). **Dvīpa Ujjvala.** University manuscript No. 561. Substance, country-made paper, 14×5 inches in size. Folia, sixteen. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The author of the book is Bansidāsa, who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীশুক পাদপঞ্চে সদা জার আস ।
পঞ্চম অধ্যায় কথা কহে বংশিদাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীহরিঃ । রাধাকৃষ্ণ । চৈতন্য কয়োতি কল্যাণঃ হৃদয়কন্দরে কেসরিঃ
সুধধ্বনিজনোকোষোনাং কোলাহল কুতুহল । ইতি । সংসার সিদ্ধতরনে হৃদয়ে
জদিস্যৎ । প্রেমাম্বুবি বিহরনে জদি চিত্তধিত্তো শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য স্বরনং শ্রয়াতু ॥
ইতি ।

The end :—

বেদউদ্ধার করে মিন-রূপ ধরি । পৃথিবী উদ্ধার করে বরাহ অবতারি ॥ পৃথিবী
ধারণ করে কুর্শ রূপ ধরি । এই মত ছিষ্টী করে নানা অবতারি ॥ শ্রীশুক পাদপঞ্চে
সদা জার আস । পঞ্চম অধ্যায় কথা কহে বংশিদাস ॥ ইতি দ্বীপ উজ্জল
গ্রন্থ সমাপ্ত । লিখিতঃ শ্রীহরি প্রসাদ দেব সম্মা সাং মোহনপুর ॥

(d) The book has been divided into five Chapters. It is written in the form of dialogues between Rupa and Sanātana. The first

chapter says that a man must adopt the nature of a woman (*i.e.*, be free from sensual desire, roughness, anger, etc.) before he can aspire to realise God. It is therefore said that Kṛṣṇa resides in the body of woman. In order to arrive at this stage of spiritual culture, the devotee should submit himself to be guided by a good Guru. The second Chapter deals with the various potentialities of Guru. The third Chapter deals with the various characteristics of the two kinds of devotees, that is, those that worship with desire for happiness and those that desire nothing whatsoever. The fourth Chapter explains the five Rasas (emotions) and incidentally refers to the subjects of love and the location of eight psycho-physiological lotuses in different parts of the human body. The fifth Chapter speaks about the nature of man.

XIV. (a) **Rāgamālā**. University manuscript No. 565. Substance, Country-made paper, 10×4 inches in size. Folia, eight. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1143 B.S. corresponding to 1737 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The author of the book is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীগুরু বৈষ্ণব পাদপদ্ম করি ধ্যান ।
সংক্ষেপে কহিল কিছু তাহার আক্ষান ॥
প্রভু সম্বন্ধে কৈল রাগমালা প্রকাশ ।
এই সব আক্ষান কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য জয় । শ্রীগুরুবে নম । অজ্ঞান তিমিরাক্ত জ্ঞানাজন
সলাকয়া চক্ষুঃস্বর্ণিতং জেনতৈশ্চ শ্রীগুরুবে নম । প্রথমে (বন্দন করি) গুরুবৈষ্ণব
চরন । তাহার প্রসাদে হয় অরিষ্ট পরান (?)

The end :—

After the colophon noted above we have—

ইতি রাগ মালা নাম সম্পূর্ণ । সন ১১৪৩ সাল তারিখ ২২ পৌষ মোকাম
ভোলতা পরগণে কতেসিংহ লিখিতং শ্রীনন্দহলাল দাস আদ্য রস শ্রীঅনন্দী রাম সিংহ
সাক্ষী ভোলতা ।

(d) The title of the book signifies that it is a book on Sahajiyā (Vaiṣṇava) poetics. It deals with the classifications of emotions and speaks about the Manjaris and identifies them with the followers of Caitanya Deva. It ends by establishing the superiority of the Ragānugā form of love.

XV. (a) *Āśrayanirṇaya*. University manuscript No. 566. Substance, country-made paper, $13 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, four. Lines, nine in the first, and the third pages while the rest have ten each. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The book is written in simple prose with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is not mentioned.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণচৈতন্তচন্দ্রায় নমঃ । অথ আশ্রয় নির্ণয় । আশ্রয় পঞ্চ প্রকার ।
কি ২ নামাশ্রয় । মন্ত্রাশ্রয় । ভাবাশ্রয় । প্রেমাশ্রয় । রসাশ্রয় । ৫ । এই
পঞ্চ প্রকার ।

The end :—

আসক্তি প্রেম ষোল আনা । কাম গায়ত্রি মন্ত্ররূপ হয় কৃষ্ণের স্বরূপ । শাঙে
চব্বিশ অক্ষর হয় । সে অক্ষর চন্দ্রযুগ । কৃষ্ণ করে উদয় । ত্রিজগত কৈল কামময় ।
শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণচন্দ্রায় নমঃ ।

As the title indicates, the book deals with various *Āśrayas* (stages of spiritual culture). It is a book on Sahajiyā poetics.

XVI. (a) *Guruśiṣya Saṁbāda*. *Upāsana Tattva*. University Manuscript No. 567. Substance, country-made paper, 10 by 4 inches in size. Folia, 1—6, and 8. Lines eleven in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1689 Saka, corresponding to 1767 A.D. The verses are *Payāra* throughout with only one quotation of a Sanskrit verse.

(b) The author of the book is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as :—

শ্রীলোক নাথ চরণ স্মরন অভিলাস ।
গুরুসিষ্ঠ সংবাদ কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ । শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত নিত্যানন্দ অবতার । আপনার শুনে সর্বজিবে
কৈল পার ॥ বন্দো শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত চুড়ামনি । পদ্মাবতি-বন্দো নিত্যানন্দ মনি ॥

The end :—

After the colophon noted above, we have—

ইতি শ্রীগুরুসিষ্ঠ সংবাদে উপাসনা তত্যানিরূপনং নাম দশম পটলং সংপূর্ণং ।
শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণভ্যাং নমঃ । জথাদৃষ্টং তথা লিখিতং লিখকো-নাস্তিদোষকং । ভোম
স্বামী রনে ভঙ্গ মুনিনাথ মতিব্রমঃ ॥ সকাব্দা ১৬৮৯ । মঙ্গলাব্দে সন ১০৭৩ সাল
তাং ২১ জ্যৈষ্ঠী রোজ সোমবার । পঞ্চমী তিথিতে সমাপ্ত হইল ॥ লিখিতং শ্রীসদা
রাম সর্দা ॥

(d) The subject has been introduced in the form of a dialogue between Srinivāsa and Gādādhara Dāsa, but later on the dialogue passes between Kṛṣṇa and the sage Nārada. The subject treated is nothing else than the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa in the form of Caitanya Deva. The Companions of Kṛṣṇa are also identified with the followers of Caitanya Deva, and Navadvipa is placed in the same status with Vṛndāvana. Nothing is said in details about Upāsana (worship), besides a short note asserting that the knowledge of various incarnations noted above will greatly help a devotee in his spiritual culture.

N.B.—We have already noticed a book of the same name in Section VII, and another bearing the name of Upāsana Paṭala in the Section VI. Though these three books are ascribed to the same writer Narottama Dāsa yet they are quite different from one another. From the concluding remark—“ইতি শ্রীশ্রী সিন্ধু সংবাদে উপাসনা তত্ত্ব নিরূপনং নাম দশম পটলং” we are led to believe that Narottama wrote an elaborate treatise under the name of Gurusīṣya Saṁbāda dealing with Upāsana and that these three books are three different Chapters of the same. The writer says that the book under review in this Section is the tenth Chapter of Gurusīṣya Saṁbāda. A similar assertion is also found at the end of the book noticed in Section VII. But we find that these two books are quite different from each other. The writers perhaps laboured under a misconception, and could not rightly differentiate the various Chapters of the complete work.

XVII. *A nameless manuscript. University manuscript No. 568. Substance, country-made paper, 13×5 inches in size. Folia, 1—6, the rest missing. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of script cannot be found as the last page is missing. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author cannot be found as the last page is missing, and there is no intermediate colophon.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ । শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত চক্রে দশা আস । তেমতি বুঝিতে চাহৌ চৈতন্তের দাস ॥ তার জে আচরণ চৈতন্ত করি ধ্যানে । মুখেতে করিব বাক্য প্রভুর নিজ গুণে ॥ চৈতন্ত নিশ্চয় লিলা করিতে বর্ণন । জে রূপে হইল প্রভুর নবদ্বিপের মন ॥ etc.

The end :—

আরজে বালকগন সিরজন করিল ।
ব্রজের জন্ম লভিতে সতে গমন করিল ॥

এসকলের মাতাপিতা কত তপ করিআছিল।

সে সকলের ব্রজে জন্ম লভিল কাহে কাহে।

তবে মূল নারায়ণ রহি.....(incomplete)

(d) The book perhaps deals with the spiritual significance of the birth of Caitanya Deva as can be guessed from the sentence "চৈতন্ত্য নিগুঢ় লিলা করিতে বর্ণন।" The writer began by narrating how Viṣṇu took birth as Kṛṣṇa in Vrindāvanāṣ. The object of the author was perhaps to speak about the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa as Caitanya Deva in the next few pages that are lost. Though the name of the author is not found, it appears from "তেমতি বৃষ্ণিতে চাহেঁ চৈতন্তের" that he was perhaps চৈতন্তের দাস for the verb is in the first person singular in this sentence. The other verbs করিব, করি are also in the first person. We do, therefore, conclude that চৈতন্তের দাস is not an epithet, but suggests a proper name.

XVIII. (a) A nameless manuscript. University manuscript No. 569. Substance, country-made paper, $12\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, one (incomplete). Lines, twelve in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of script cannot be found. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author cannot be found as the manuscript is incomplete.

(c) The beginning:—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ। বর্তমান আরতি পিরিতি রস শেবে। নিরন্তর পরবস পিরিতির
লোভে ॥ দুই এক বুদ্ধি হয় দুই বিভ্রমান। দুই জানে হুঁকার মরম গেম্যান।
দুই রসে বিদগধ রূপে শুনে সমা। তবে সে উপজে সহজ ভক্তি রস প্রেমা। পুরুষ
প্রকৃতি দুই রসের আকার। পরকীয়া রসে সদা করয়ে বেহার ॥

The end :

আত্মা সাধ করি মোরে লইল জে কালে। আজ্ঞা মাগিলাঙ্ আমি চরণ কমলে ॥
সদয় হইয়া মোরে এক আজ্ঞা দিলা। সেই আজ্ঞা পাঞা মোর ভরসা বাটীলা ॥
যে কৰ্ম করি যে আমি সেই আজ্ঞা বলে। সে চরন হৈতে যেন মন নাহি চলে ॥

(d) The author speaks about Sahajiyā love when man and woman should be wholly absorbed in love for each other, and the spiritual culture should be learnt before a Guru.

N.B.—The book aims at the elucidation of the Sahajiyā doctrine. The beginning is excellent but all the pages except one is sadly missing.

XIX. (a) Siddha Tikā. University manuscript No. 570. Substance, Country-made paper, 11×4 inches in size. Folia, eight,

Lines, eight in a page except the first page which has got nine lines. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra and prose mixed.

(b) The name of the author is Raghunāth Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণাভ্যাং নমঃ । আশ্রয়তত্ত্ব । পুরুষ প্রকৃতি গুরু হয় দুই রূপ ।
প্রবর্ত দেহেতে গুরু কৃষ্ণের স্বরূপ ॥ সাধক দেহেতে গুরু ললিতা প্রধান । রাধিকার
বামে বসি তাবুল জোগান ॥ etc.

The end :—

প্রিয়গদাধর কোন শুনে । অবতার শুনে । বাহ্যকল্পতরু কোন শুনে । ভক্ত
বাহ্যাপুর শুনে । রাগি বিরাগি পার্থি । এই তিন । তার বিবরণ । রাগির
রাগময়ি । বিরাগি রাগাধিকার । সোল আনা পূর । ইতি রঘুনাথ দাস বিরচিতং ।
সিদ্ধটীকা সংপূর্ণ ।

(d) This is a book on Sahajiyā poetics. The subjects treated are about different Āśrayas (stages of spiritual culture), Rupas (manifestations), Gurus (Teachers), Prema (love), Ratis (affection) and Manjaris (manifested in emotions), etc.

N.B.—There is some doubt as to the real name of the book. In the beginning we have it as “Āśraya Tattva” (আশ্রয়তত্ত্ব), but the end notes “the conclusion of Siddha Tikā” (সিদ্ধটীকা). It may be that Āśraya Tattva is one of the Chapters (perhaps the last) of Siddhatikā.

XX. (a) **Rāgamayikaṇā**. University manuscript No. 571. Substance, country-made paper, 13 × 4½ inches in size. Folia, eight (the rest missing). Lines varying from eight to eleven in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of script cannot be found as the last page is missing. The verses are Payāra and prose mixed.

(b) The name of the author cannot be found out.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণ যত্নতাং । শ্রীগুরবে নমঃ । প্রথমে বন্দব (—) চন্দ্রণ । জার রূপা
বলে হয় বাঞ্ছিত পূরণ । etc.

The end :

ভাব হাব হেলা এই তি (ন) বস্ত্র হয় কেমন লক্ষন । কহিএ যে সব কথা
কহি বিবরণ । ভাব বলি এক কথা সম্পূর্ণ কাহিনী । ললিতার অঙ্গ হয় ভাব
.....incomplete.

(d) The book deals with the subjects of Bhāva (emotions), Upāsana (worship), Guru (spiritual instructor) and Manjaris (Companions of Rādhā), etc.

N.B.—Vide Section XXVII.

XXI. (a) Rativilāsapaddhati. University manuscript No. 572. Substance, Country-made paper, $10 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, twenty-four. Lines, eleven in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Rasika Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

“রসসুখ মূৰ্ত্তা রসিকদাস মুচমতি” ।

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাক্ষণ । নতোন্মোহং গৌর সচিগভৌজেন্দুং । সংভক্তি সিদ্ধান্ত
প্রবাহে সিদ্ধং সহজার্থং প্রমামৃতাক্ষ গুঢ়ং মায়াদিতোন্ময়ং ন বহিঃপ্রকাশং ॥ বন্দো
সচিগভৌজেন্দু গৌর ভগবান । সংভক্তি সিদ্ধান্ত সিদ্ধ প্রবাহে বিশ্রাম ॥ সহজ
প্রমামৃতে গুঢ়রূপে আশ্বাদিলা । স্বয়ং আশ্বাদিত বাহে প্রকাশ না কৈলা ॥

The end :—

After the colophon noted above—

রূপানুগ্রহে রতিবিলাস পদ্ধতি । সমাপ্তায়াং গ্রন্থ “রতি বিলাস” পদ্ধতি ॥ জ্ঞা-
দুঃখং তথা লিখিতং ইত্যাদি ।

(d) The book says that Bharata received four Slokas from his father Brahmā. As he could not understand the real significance of those Slokas he went to Nārāyana in Goloka, and asked Him the significance of material and immaterial body. While answering this question, Nārāyana felt the desire of taking birth as a man in Vṛndāvana in order to enjoy for Himself the sweetness of Parakiyā love. Then the poet takes up many Slokas of Bhāgavat, Caitanya Caritāmrta and Rāgamālā etc., and offers explanations to them. The aim of the author is always to establish the superiority of the Parakiyā love, because it is steady and permanent.

XXII. (a) Gurusīṣya Saṁbāda Upāśya Upāsanā Tattva. University manuscript No. 573. Substance, country-made paper. $14 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, 1-2, 4 and 8. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1177 B.S., corresponding to 1771 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b). The author of the book is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীলোকনাথ চরনে জার অভিলাস ।

শুধু শিশু সখাদ কহেন নরভ্রম দাস ॥

c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ যুগল চরন প্রাপ্তিঃ। সহজ পিরিতি কবিতা লিখন। জাহা
হইতে কৃষ্ণ স্বয়ং ভগবান হঅ ॥ সেই বস্ত্র সাধে ভক্ত কৃষ্ণ নাহি লঅ ॥ রাধা কৃষ্ণ ভজে
রাধা কৃষ্ণ নাম লঞা। জ্ঞানকালে জপতপ হুরেতে তেয়াগিঞা ॥

The end :—

After the colophon noted above—

ইতি শ্রীশুকশিশু সন্থাদে উপাশ্রু উপাসনা তত্ত্ব নিরূপনং নাম দশম পটল। ইতি
গ্রন্থ সম্পূর্ণঃ! সুঅক্ষর শ্রীশুক প্রসাদ কৰ্ম্মকার সাং.....লকি মোঃ বনমালীপুর
পরগনে ভোম সন ১১৭৭ সাল তাং ২৭ আ(ষা)ড় বার রবি তিথি নয়মি বেলা ষিপর ॥

(d) The book deals with various subjects. After dealing with Rādhā and her companions and their Sahaja love, it speaks about the three abodes of Kṛṣṇa. and concludes by referring to the birth of Nārāyaṇa as Kṛṣṇa in Mathurā.

N.B.—Two books bearing the same name have already been noticed (*vide sections VI, VII and XVI*). This book is quite different from any of them. We think the book under review in this section is another chapter of the *Guruśiṣyasambhāda* written by Narottama Dāsa.

XXIII. (a) **Aśrayanirṇaya**. University manuscript No. 575. Substance, country-made paper, 11 × 6 inches in size. Folia, six. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1219 B. S., corresponding to 1813 A.D. The verses are Payāra and prose mixed.

(b) The name of the author is not given.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণঃ। অথ আশ্রয় নির্ণয় লিখতে। আশ্রয় পঞ্চ প্রকার। কি ক পঞ্চ
প্রকার। নামাশ্রয়। মন্ত্রাশ্রয়। ভাবাশ্রয়। প্রেমাশ্রয়। রসাশ্রয়। এই পঞ্চ
প্রকার। তথাহিঃ। রসভক্তিচন্দ্রিকাঅ। আশ্রয়ের কথা কিছু করি নিবেদন।
জে মতে আশ্রয় হঅ সুন শ্রোতাগন। etc., etc.

The end :—

এবং শ্রীমতির বোনমালা। ১ এক ॥ এবং কৃষ্ণর বো(ন) মালা ১ বৈজয়ন্তি-
মালা। ১ ॥ মুক্তামালা ১ ॥ ইতি আশ্রয় নির্ণয় সমাপ্ত। লিখিতং শ্রীমাতুর দাস
বৈরাগী। সাকিম মথাকাঠা। পাটক শ্রীকেনারাম সেন সাংগাতী। ইতি সন
১২১৯ স, তাং ২৭ পৌষ। বার বনিবার রাজে সমাপ্ত।

(d) The book deals with the various stages of spiritual life. It also treats about the characteristics of Prabarta (beginning), Sādhaka (worship) and Siddha (enlightened) stages, and about

different manifestations of feelings, such as *Ālambana*, *Uddipana* etc., about *Rāga* (love), *Rati* (affection), *Bhāva* (emotions), etc.

N.B.—A book bearing the same title has already been noticed in section XV, but the book under review is quite different from the same, as the quotations from the beginning and the end will show.

XXIV. (a) *Sādhana Nirṇaya Tattva*. University manuscript No. 576. Substance, country-made paper, 14 × 5 inches in size. Folia, seventeen (incomplete). Lines, twelve in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of script cannot be found as the book is incomplete. The verses are *Payāra* throughout with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is *Goswāin Kṛṣṇahari*, who puts himself in the intermediate quotations as—

সাধন নির্ণয় তত্ত্ব কহেন গোসাঁঞি কৃষ্ণহরি ।

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ । শ্রীচৈতন্যচন্দ্রায় নম । জঅ ২ শ্রীচৈতন্য জঅ নিত্যানন্দ ।
জঅ যেত চন্দ্র জঅ গৌর ভক্ত বিন্দুঃ । জঅ হরিদাস আর মুকুন্দ মুরারি । তোমা
সভার চরণ ব্রন্দো সিরের উপরি ।

The end :—

কণ্টক আনিয়া বাড়ি বান্ধিতে লাগিল । নবানহিন হস্তে কত কণ্টক বাজিল ।
ডুরি লইতে জেঞি হস্তে কণ্টক বাজঅ । অতি উচ্চস্বরে কৃষ্ণ বলিআ (...)
কঅ । রসিকসাগর কৃষ্ণ শুনিবারে পান ।(অসম্পূর্ণ)

(d) The book speaks about eight *Sukhis* (representing eight principal emotions) and *Manjaris* (representing subsidiary emotions), about the love-amours of *Kṛṣṇa* in *Vṛndāvana*, about the means of attaining God through love, about certain episodes of the lives of *Rupa*, *Sānatana*, *Rāmānanda* and others by way of illustrations, about the nine *Rasiks* (devout worshippers through love), about *Caṇḍīdās* and *Rāmi*, and about *Villamangala* and *Cintāmani*.

XXV. (a) A nameless manuscript. University manuscript No. 579. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 4 inches in size. Folia, four (incomplete). Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of the script cannot be found as the book is incomplete. The book is written in simple prose with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author cannot be found as the book is incomplete and there are no intermediate quotations.

(c) The beginning:—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত বয়ভাং । কৃষ্ণে স্বারবিকী রাগঃ পরমাভিষ্টতা ভবেৎ । তদ্বরাঙ্গা
ভাব ভক্তি সাওরাগা ত্রিকোচ্যতেঃ । ইতি রাগাস্তিকি লক্ষণং ।

The end :—

মানসী ভাবয়েৎ চিন্তয়েৎ সনন্দ নন্দন কৃষ্ণ নন্দ গোপসুত । অহং গোপী পরম
লজন । বাচকি বজ্রেৎ । ব্রজবাসী । কাষীকি ব্রজলোক অনুসার ক্রিআসিদ্ধন্ত ।

(d) Beginning with the characteristics of Rāgātmikā and Rāgānugā love, it goes on dealing with worship and the object of worship, and speaks about Manjaris, about different kinds of Rati and Bhāva, and about three kinds of worship in body, mind and speech.

XXVI. (a) *Caitanya Rasa Kārikā*. University manuscript No. 580. Substance, country-made paper, 11×4 inches in size. Folia, nine. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author is Yugala Kīśor Dās, who puts himself in the colophon as :—

যুগল কিশোর দাসের আর কেহো নাঞি ।
এই বার মোর হও চৈতন্ত নিতাই ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীগোরাবঃ । হেনকুলিত খেদয়া বিষদয়া শ্রৌণ্মীন দামোদয়া সৰ্বশাস্ত্রবিবদয়া
রসদয়া চিন্তাহিপিতোন্মাদয়া স্বঃ স্ব ভক্তি বিনদয়া মাধুৰ্য্য মধ্যান্দয়া শ্রীচৈতন্ত দয়ানিধে
ভবদয়া ভূয়াদ মন্দোদয় ॥ জয় নবদ্বীপচন্দ্রগৌর গুণধাম । দয়ার ঠাকুর মোর
নিত্যানন্দ রাম ॥

The end :—

রাধা প্রিয়োত্তম সখি প্রাপ্ত অহুরাগী । সন্তাস আশ্রম গৌর জাতে হৈলা যোগী ।
এ মৰ্ম্ম না বুঝি মোর ছঃখে কাটে হিয়া । মরি মরি গৌর চক্রেয় নিছনি লইয়া ॥
যুগল কিশোর দাসের আর কেহো নাঞি । এই বার মোর হও চৈতন্ত নিতাই—।
ইতি চৈতন্তরসকরিকা গ্রন্থ সংপূর্ণঃ ॥

(d) After invocations to Caitanya, the poet says, that divine love was manifested in Vraja. Kṛṣṇa in order to taste that love, incarnated himself in Nadia in the form of Caitanya Deva. Hereafter he gives a brief account of the life of the latter.

XXVII. (a) *Rāgamayikanā*. University manuscript No. 581. Substance, country-made paper, 14×5 inches in size. Folia, ten. Lines, seven to nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. Verses are Payāra mixed with simple prose.

(b) The name of the author is Kṛṣṇa Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীরূপ রঘুনাথ পদে জার আস ।
রাগমই কনা কিছু কহে কৃষ্ণ দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণভ্যা নম । শ্রীশ্রীবৈষ্ণব গোসাঞি চরনভো নম । অজ্ঞানতিমিরাক্ত
জ্ঞানাজন সলাকয়া । চক্কুন্নিলিতং জেন তশৈ শ্রীগুরুবে নমঃ । প্রথমে বন্দিব গুরু
গোবিন্দচরণ । etc.

The end :—

এতেক লক্ষণ কহিলা শ্রীজীব গোশাঞী । শ্রীরূপ চরন বিহু আরগতি নাই ।
গ্রন্থ রাগমই তার চূষন দেখিল । ইহাতে সাধক কিছু বুঝিতে পারিল । বিজাতিয়
লোকে কতু না দেখাবে । রসিক ভকত দেখি কথা তার পিবে । এই গ্রন্থ না দেখিলে
উপাসনা নয় । উপাসনা না বুঝিলে রাধা কৃষ্ণ প্রাপ্তি নয় ॥ শ্রীরূপ রঘুনাথ পদে জার
আস । রাগমই কনা কিছু কহে কৃষ্ণদাস । ইতি শ্রীরাগমই কনা সমাপ্ত ।

(d) This is the same book noticed in section XX. The last page of that manuscript is missing, hence the name of the author could not be found. The book under review undoubtedly proves that Kṛṣṇa Dāsa is the author of the work. There is slight variation in the beginning of the two books, due perhaps to the peculiar tendencies of the scribes, the verses are almost similar.

XXVIII. (a) **Campakakalikā Grantha.** University manuscript No. 584. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 5½ inches in size. Folia, thirteen. Lines, ten to fourteen in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1698 Saka corresponding to 1776 A.D. The verses are Payāra with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is not given in the book.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্তচন্দ্রঃ । যথ শ্রীজীব গোস্বামির স্মরণী টীকা অহুসারে বেদবর্ষা
স্মরণিয়াদ্ব্যাত তত্র ইতি । বন্দেহং শ্রীগুরুং শ্রীযুত পদকমলং শ্রীগুরুন শ্রীবৈষ্ণবাক
শ্রীরূপং সাগ্রজাতং সগন রঘুনাথানিতং তং সাজিবং সাধৈতং সা বধৈতং পরিজন সহিতং
শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত দেবং শ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ পাদান সগন ললিতা শ্রীবিসাখান্নিতাংচ ॥ etc.

The end :—

তস্তাবেব ভাবিত মঞ্জরি পরিচয় । উপাসনা বস্তু এই কহিলাম তোমাষ ॥ ইতি
শ্রীরূপ সনাতন মুখাগ্রবাচ উপাসনা বস্তু সাধ্য সমাপ্ত । ইতি শ্রীজীব গোস্বামীর
স্মরণটীকা গ্রন্থে অহুসারে চম্পককলিকা গ্রন্থ সম্পূর্ণ । সকাব্দা ১৬৯৮ সা বিতারিখ
২ অশ্বিন । পুস্তকনিজ লিখিতং সাওপাত্র মো.....খাতচা ।

(d) The book begins by saying how Rupa went to Vṛndāvana, six years before Sanātana, and how Sanātana was punished by the Mahomedan Emperor for his neglect of duties, and how he bribed the jailor Habu and went out of the prison disguised as a Mahomedan mendicant and crossed the river on the back of a crocodile, and met Caitanya Deva and Rupa Goswāmi. Rupa and Sanātana went out to see Vṛndāvana, and when seated on the hill Govardhana, Rupa asked Sanātana about the situation of the Nitya (imperishable) world, and how men are born in this world and where they go after death. The answer given by Sanātana is the subject of the book under review. Herein are described how the world originated from Campakakalikā, the origin and description of Rupa and all the Manjaris.

N.B.—According to the author, Campakakalikā is based upon Smaraṇaṭikā of Jiva Goswāmi. In the last chapter of the book there is a discussion about the theory of Upāsanā. The name of the author is not given at the end of the book, but there is an intermediate colophon which runs as follows—

মহাপ্রভুর আজ্ঞামত অনুসারে ।
নিত্য নির্ণয় কথা কহে নরে স্বরে ॥

It is difficult to say whether Naresvara is an adjective of Sanātana, the narrator of the subjects treated in this book, or it is the name of the author.

XXIX.* (a) Sādhya Prema Candrikā. University manuscript No. 585. Substance, country-made paper, 13×4½ inches in size. Folia, eight. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1183 B.S., corresponding to 1771 A.D. The verses are Payāra and Tripadī with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীশুরু পাদ পদ্ম মনে করি আস ।
সাধ্য প্রেম ভক্তি চন্দ্রিকা কহে নরতাম দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধা কৃষ্ণ চরণে নমো । অজ্ঞান তিমিরাক্ত জ্ঞানাজন সলাকয়া চক্ৰকমিত
জেন তবৈ শ্রীশুরুবে নম ॥ রাধা কৃষ্ণ প্রাণ মোর যুগল কিষোর । জীবনে মরনে

গতি যায় নাহি যোর ॥ শ্রীশুক প্রসাদে ভাই হেন ধনপাই । কার মেকম বাক্যে
তজ শ্রীশুক চয়ন ॥

The end :—

After the colophon noted above—

ইতি সাধ্য প্রেম ভক্তি চক্রিকা সমাপ্ত । ঐ মনবদ সদাকৃষ্ণ জিদয়ং বেষ্টিত শুভা-
ব্রতে । কালোতি কালজায়ন্তি দিবসবদবদস্তার্থকং ॥ শ্রীভাগবতে । শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত
ভক্তি বিহিনাং তেসাং বৃথাজন্ম নরাধমানাং যেষেব সান্তানিবহন্তি ভাব গুরদং
মদার্থে । ইতি সাং ১১৮৩ সাল পাঠনার্থে শ্রীকৃষ্ণ বাউল লিখিতং শ্রীচন্দ্র মোহন দত্ত
সাং বাউতোলাধি ॥

(d) The book treats about the methods of spiritual culture. A devotee should surrender himself to a Manjari and carry out the instructions of a Guru. Then the author refers to Bhāba, Prema etc., and prescribes everlasting heaven for the Vaiṣṇavas who follow the principles laid down in this book.

XXX. (a) *Rativilāsa Paddhati*. University manuscript No. 586. Substance, country-made paper, $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Lines in a page vary from twelve to twenty. Folia, eleven. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1188 B.S., corresponding to 1782 A.D.

N.B.—This is the same book noticed in section XXI. The date of that script is not given, while the book under review in this section is dated.

XXXI. (a) *Rāgamayikāṇā*. University manuscript No. 587. Substance, country-made paper, $13\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, eight. Lines, ten in a page, etc.

N.B.—This is the same book noticed in sections XX and XXVII. There the manuscripts are not dated, while this one is dated 1189 B.S., corresponding to 1783 A.D.

XXXII. (a) *Bhaktirasātmikā*. University manuscript No. 588. Substance, country-made paper, $12\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, five. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1200 B.S., corresponding to 1794 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Akincana Dāsa who puts himself in colophon as—

শ্রীচৈতন্ত নিত্যানন্দ ভক্তির প্রকাশ ।

ভক্তি রসান্তিকা কহেন যক্ষিণদাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ । শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য চন্দ্রায় নম ॥ রাজাহুলসিত ভূজো কনকাবদাতোঃ
সংকর্ত্ত নৈকপিতরো কুমলাযতাক্ষো বিশ্বভরো দ্বিজবরো যুগধর্মপালো বন্দেজগত
প্রিয়করো করুণাবতারো ॥ জয় ২ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য নিত্যানন্দ । জয়াধৈতচন্দ্র জয়
গৌরভক্ত বৃন্দ ॥ etc.

The end :—

After the colophon noted above—

ইতি শ্রীচৈতন্য-ভক্তিতত্ত্ববিলাস সংপূর্ণ ॥ লিখিতং শ্রীপদ্মলোচন নন্দি সাক্ষি
খাটুল গ্রাম পরগণে জাহানাবাদ ইতি সন ১২০০ সাল তারিখ রবিবার ।

(d) The book is written in the form of dialogues between Caitanya and Nityānanda. Each question put by the latter is answered briefly in two or three sentences by the former. The author touches upon various topics, such as the salvation of men, benefit of Harināma, liberality and Bhakti, etc.

XXXIII. (a) *Āśrayanirṇaya*. University manuscript No. 589. Substance, country-made paper, $13\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, six. Lines vary from nine to ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra mixed with prose and occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীলোকনাথ গোস্বামির পদ অভিলাস ।

আশ্রয় নির্ণয় কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য জয় জয় । নিত্যানন্দঃ মহং বন্দেঃ করে লসিতঃ মোক্তিকঃ চৈতন্য-
অগ্রজ রূপেন পবিত্রিত্ব ভূতলং । etc.

The end :—

ইথে অবিশ্বাস জার সেই মুখরাজ । আপনার মুণ্ডে সে আপনে পড়ে বাজ ॥ শ্রদ্ধা
কার এই তত্ত্ব পড়ে জেই জন । সিদ্ধ দেহ হঞা পায় কৃষ্ণের চরণ ॥ শ্রীলোকনাথ
গোস্বামির পদ অভিলাস । আশ্রয় নির্ণয় কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥ ইতি আশ্রয় নির্ণয়
গ্রন্থ সম্পূর্ণ ॥

(d) The subjects treated in this book are mostly the same dealt with other books of the same name noticed in sections XV and XXIII, but the beginning and the end do not agree. Moreover, the names of the authors of those two books are not noted in them, but we have the same noted down in the book under review in this section. It is quite possible that Narottama was the first writer

on this subject. He was later on imitated by others or the difference might have been caused by the activities of scribes.

XXXIV. (a) *Siddhānta Lahari*. University manuscript No. 591. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 5 inches in size. Folia, fifteen. Lines vary from nine to ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The author of the work is Yugala who puts himself in the colophon as—

জাহ্নবা (জাহ্নবী) নিতাই পদ হৃদয়েতে ধরি ।
এ দিন যুগল কহে সিদ্ধান্ত লহরি ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্যচন্দ্রোজয়তি । অজ্ঞান তিমিরাক্ত জ্ঞানাজনসলাকরা । চক্ষুর
শ্লিষিতং জেন তস্মৈ শ্রীগুরবে নমঃ । প্রথমে বন্দিব গুরু গোসাঞি চরন । অজ্ঞান
তিমির নাশি কৈল শুদ্ধ মন ॥ পতিত পাবন প্রভু শ্রীগুরু গোসাঞি । চক্ষু দান
দিল্য জিহ্বা কৃপা দিঠে চাই ॥

The end :—

বৈষ্ণবের পদদল আর পদরেণু । সাধন না জানি মুঞি এ অমৃত বিহু ॥ জাহ্নবা
(জাহ্নবী) নিতাই পদ হৃদয়েতে ধরি । এ দিন যুগল কহে সিদ্ধান্ত লহরী । ইতি
শ্রীসিদ্ধান্ত লহরি সমাপ্ত ।

(d) The poet begins with invocations to Guru, Caitanya, Nityānanda and other famous Vaiṣṇava saints. The subject is then introduced in the form of a dialogue between a Guru and his disciple. He explains what are āśrayas (stages of spiritual culture), Ālambana and Uddipana (the object of emotion, and that which helps the growth of emotion) and speaks about Prabarta, Sādhaka and Siddha, and of culture in body, mind and speech. He then deals with Rāga (love), Sakhis and Manjaris (companions of Rādhā representing emotions), and lastly with Svakiyā and Parakiyā love.

XXXV. (a) *Caitta Rupā Padmamālā*. University manuscript No. 592. Substance, country-made paper, 13 × 4½ inches in size. Folia, eight (incomplete). Lines, twelve in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of the script cannot be found as the copy is incomplete. The verses are Payāra mixed with copious Sanskrit quotations and prose.

(b) The name of the author cannot be found as the book is incomplete.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীচৈতন্য চন্দ্রায় নমঃ ২। অহং কনক কেতকি কুমুম গৌর বটকিতো নবদ্বি-
সিতা বিবিদাস পুত্র শ্রিতে অতএব বিয়াকিপিনং বস্ততাং ভজস সচিবুত মহি প্রভু করু
মকুল বদিকিসাং। অথ চৈতন্য ২ অথ চেতন রূপে চৈতন্য অথ চৈত্রে রূপে চৈতন্য
শব্দরূপে চৈতন্য অথ প্রকটরূপে চৈতন্যের কহি বিবরণ ॥

The end :—

কাদি করিলে কি হয়। ব্রজ জনের রিত হয়। আর মাহাস্ত শ্ররূপ চৈত্রে রূপ
হয়। জন্ম কিণা। পিতামাতার উদরে। কিস্তে জন্মঃ দ্বন্দ্বমুদ্রে। তারলকন
কি। সনিঃশুক্ৰঃ।

(d) The poet begins with invocations to Caitanya and his followers among whom he specially praises Ray Rāmānanda. He deals with the theories of various ponds and Padmas (lotuses), much after the manner of the Amṛta Ratnāvalī and Dehanirṇaya noticed in Sections IV and V. The book also attempts to narrate the psycho-physiological system of the Sahajiyās, and so it is highly indebted to the Tantras. The book is full of technical terms, and is mostly written in mystic language.

XXXVI. (a) *Vastu Kaṭacā*. University manuscript No. 594. Substance, country-made paper, $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ inches in size. Folia, five. Lines, fourteen in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author is not given, but there is a note to the effect that the book was written by Svarupa Goswāmi.

As Rupa Goswāmi is not likely the author of this Bengali manuscript, it is quite possible that the book was written in Bengal by a Vaiṣṇava, who took the Kaṭacā of Rupa Goswāmi as his model. The following quotation supports this theory—

স্বরূপ করিল। ইহা অল্পভাব বঙ্গনে।

(c) The beginning :—

After the verses of invocations which are very indistinct—

জঅ জঅ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য জঅ নিত্যানন্দ। জআৰ্হেতচন্দ্র জঅ গৌরভক্তবৃন্দ ॥
প্রবর্তক সাধক লিঙ্গী তিনের করন। ক্রমে ক্রমে কহি তাহা শুনভক্তগন ॥

The end :—

ইতি শুর গোষ্ঠে গোষ্ঠানই শ্রবমঙ্গলগন সহিতাং শুনবোস্ত পঞ্চাসত্যাং শ্রুসোভিত
রসভবা সাধ্যসমা বঅ সাএ কএগন সহগন প্রকাশং পুনরসপুঞ্জ ॥

(d) The author speaks about the reverence to Guru as the means of emancipation, and deals with Vaidhi (supported by Śāstras) and

Parakiyā mode of spiritual culture, speaking about the latter as the better of the two.

XXXVII. (a) **Deha Kaḍacā.** University manuscript No. 593. Substance, country-made paper, $11 \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ inches in size, Folia, four. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The book is written mostly in simple prose with occasional Sanskrit quotations and Payāra towards the end of the book.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণায় নমঃ। তুমি কে। আমি জীব। তুমি কোন্ জীব। আমি তটস্থ জীব। থাকেন কোথা ভাণ্ডে। ভাণ্ড কিরূপে হইল, তত্ত্ব বস্তু হইতে। তত্ত্ব বস্তু কি কি পঞ্চ আত্মা। একাদশেন্দ্রিয়ঃ। ছয় রিপুঃ। এই সকল এক জোঙ্গে ভাণ্ড হৈল।

The end :—

নিত্য পরিবার গোলোক স্বয়ং প্রধান। মাধুর্য্য নিত্য প্রকট অতয়েব মাধুর্য্য প্রকট। রূপে নিত্য বিহার। অতয়েব মাধুর্য্য নাএক সিংহ গুহ। নরশতম দাষের দেহকড়চা। ইতি দেহকড়চা ॥

(d) The book aims at the explanation of various technical terms used by the Sahajiyās, such as Jīva, Bhāṇḍa, Rupa, Svarupa, etc. There is also a discussion about Sahajiyā love which, according to the author, cannot be learnt unless taught by a Guru. The peculiarities of a good Nāyikā (female companion for spiritual culture) are narrated in details giving the mystic significance of her nose, eye, ear, etc.

XXXVIII. (a). **A nameless manuscript.** University manuscript No. 596. Substance, country-made paper, 13×5 inches in size. Folia, 2-12, the first page is missing. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1210 B. S. corresponding to 1804 A.D. The verses are Payāra mixed with occasional prose.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—(from the 2nd page)

নবদ্বিপ গনন তিন মত হয়। নবদ্বিপ বলি জথা ভক্তি বিরাজয় ॥ নবখণ্ড প্রাণিবি তারে নবদ্বিপ কয়।.....স্নাতঃ নবদ্বিপ চৈতন্য প্রকাশয়ঃ ॥ নবখণ্ড দ্বিপমধ্যে কীরণ বিলাষ। এই নবদ্বিপে হয় পরম উল্লাসঃ ॥

The end :—

তার ভার ক্রমা পূরে দেখিল ইন্দ্রঃ। অমুরাগে জন্মভেল গোকুল নগরেঃ ॥ দোহাতে পিরিতি শব্দ করয়ে শকারেঃ। গোপী শব্দে রাশ করে প্রকট বিহরেঃ ॥

ইতি সন ১২১০ শাল তারিখ ১৮ আশ্বিন শুক্রবার শ্রীকৃষ্ণ পক্ষ চতুর্থী দীবা হই দণ্ড
পূর্ণতঃ ॥ শ্রীমুত নিলমনি চক্রবর্তি সাং বোজারঃ ॥ স্বকিয় গ্রন্থঃ ॥ যথাদোষ্টে তথা-
লিখিতং লিখকের দৌধ নাস্তীকং দাশাহুদাশ শ্রীশিবচন্দ্র মিত্র সাং সাতীধান ।

(d) The poet speaks about three Vṛndāvana, such as Vana Vṛndāvana, Mana Vṛndāvana (in the mind of the worshipper) and Nitya Vṛndāvana (topmost heaven). He then deals with Āśrayas, Prema, Bhakti and Rati, etc.

N.B.—The name of the author is given in the last page. There it is thus stated—

রতি শাধন করে শদা দাস নরভূম ॥

XXXIX. (a). **Rasa Ujjvala**. University manuscript No. 598. Substance, country-made paper, 11 × 5 inches in size. Folia, 1, 2, and 11, the other pages are missing. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1219 B.S., corresponding to 1813 A. D. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Jagannātha Dāsa who puts himself in the Colophon as—

রসবতি রাতুল চরন করি আস ।

শ্রীসউজ্জল কহে জগন্নাথ দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীভাণ্ড । অথ রসউজ্জল লিখিতে । অজ্ঞান তিমারাক্তঃ জ্ঞানজন সলাকআঃ চক্ষু-
ক্লম্বিতং জেন তম্বে শ্রীশুক্রবে নমঃ ॥ প্রথমে বন্দিব শুক্ল গোবিন্দ চরণ । অজ্ঞান
তিমির নাম কৈল জেই জন ॥ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত বন্দো কোকনা সাগর ।

The end :—

রসবতি নারি আর রসেক নাগর । রসপূর্ণ করি ভজ গুণের সাগর ॥ জথা
দিষ্টো তথা লিখিতং লিখোক দৌস নাস্তিক । ইতি সন ১২১৯ শাল ২১ ফাল্গুন
লিখিতং শ্রীমাতুর দাশ বৈরাগী পাটক শ্রীকেশরাম সেন সাং মুজাকোটী সাং নিজগ্রাম ।

(d) After invocations to the renowned Vaisṇava saints, the author speaks about the three stages of Prabarta, Sādhaka and Siddha. The book ends after dealing with the significance of the names of Caitanya, Nityānanda and Advaita.

XL. (a) **Upāsanā Paṭala**. University manuscript No. 599. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 4 inches in size. Folia, fifteen. Lines vary from six to ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1223 B. S., corresponding to 1817 A. D. The book is written in prose and Payāra mixed with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

তোমা সভার পদরজ চিত্তে অভিলাশ ।
উপাসনা পটল কহেন নরোত্তম দাশ ॥

(c) The beginning—

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণ । অখণ্ডক জাতিয় ধর্ম লিখিতে । সংসার সমুদ্র (?) তিক্তী: কৃষ্ণ
কান্তা সমজিনি: । কায়মনবাচা সিদ্ধ শ্রীনন্দনন্দন: । প্রবর্তি কারয়াশ্রয় শ্রীগুরু চরণ ॥

The end :—

মোর কি সাহস লিলা কি বর্ণিতে পারি । ভক্ত পদ রজ মাত্র ভরসা আমারি ॥
শ্রীচৈতন্য নিত্যানন্দ অধৈত চরন । দস্তে ত্বন করি মাগৌ দেহ শ্রীচরণ ॥ তোমা
সভার পদরজ চীত্তে যতিলাশ । উপাসনা পটল করে নরোত্তম দাশ ॥ ইতি উপাসনা
পটল সম্পূর্ণ । লিখিতং শ্রীমধুসূদন নন্দি সা: কাটাগোতি সন ১২২৩ সাল ।

(d) The book is divided into three parts. The first part deals with what is called *Guru Jātiya Dhamma*, i.e., the religion based upon the worship of Guru. The second part deals with *Niṣṭhā* and *Ruci* (Purity and attachment), while the third about the subject of *Upāsana* (worship). The hand writing of the first part is quite different from that of the other two. It is also written in prose while the other two are written in *Payāra*. It is, therefore, highly possible that the first part is a book in itself and has no connection with the other two parts. The name of this book is *Guru Jātiya Dhamma*. It ends abruptly in the page eleventh of the manuscript, where only the first part of a Sanskrit quotation can be traced. As this part is incomplete the name of the author, as well as the date of the script cannot be found out. The hand writing of the second and the third part is similar and there is connection between the two. We, therefore, conclude that the last part of this manuscript contains the last few pages of *Upāsana Paṭala* by Narottama Dāsa. The first eleven pages of this book is, therefore, missing. We have already noticed a book under this name in Section VI of this report. But by comparing the two we find that there is no similarity between the two.

The first part deals with the various characteristics of *Prabarta*, *Sādhaka* and *Siddha*, and gives the psycho-physiology of the different parts of the human body. Then it deals with *Prema* (Love), *Sēvā* (service), *Niṣṭhā* (devotion), etc.

The second part deals with *Vaidhi Bhakti* (love according to the dictates of the Śāstras) but gives preference to *Rāgānugā* or free

love. The difference between Kāma and Prema is elucidated much after the Caitanya Caritāmṛta.

XLI. (a). *Guṇātmikā*. University manuscript No. 600. Substance, country-made paper, $13\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, four. Lines vary from eleven to twelve in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1225 B.S., corresponding to 1819 A.D. The book is written in prose and Payāra mixed with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Rāmcandra Dāsa who puts himself in the Colophon as—

এইত সাধন ভক্তি বড়ই বিশ্বাস ।
শুনাত্মিকা কহে এই রামচন্দ্র দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ । শ্রীকৃষ্ণচৈতন্যচন্দ্রায় নমঃ । গোবিন্দং রসমানন্দং শ্রীকৃষ্ণাবন
সুখাশ্রয় ॥ তৎ কৃষ্ণাবনং কণিকা গোবিন্দং পার্শ্ববৎ হরে ॥ জয় জয় শ্রীমদন গোপাল
গোপিনাথ । জয় জয় মদনমোহন জয় জগন্নাথ ॥ জয় জয় শ্রীরাধারমন শ্রীকৃষ্ণাবন
চন্দ্র । জয় জয় কলি তিমির নাশি গৌরচন্দ্রঃ ॥ etc.

The end :—

After the colophon noted above—

ইতি শ্রীশুপাত্যিকা গ্রন্থ সমাপ্ত্যায়ং । এই গ্রন্থ লিখক শ্রীবলরাম দত্ত সাঃ জিজ্ঞাস্তা,
পঃ দধিঘোড়েপুর মোঃ হাতিয়া পঃ ফতেপুর । শকাব্দাঃ ১৭৪০ সক । সন ১২২৫
সাল । তারিখ ১০ কার্তিক রোজ রবিবার । কৃষ্ণপক্ষ । ১১ একাদশী । বেলা
১ এক পহর.....সমাপ্ত হইল ।

(d) The book begins by speaking about the fine Guṇas of Kṛṣṇa, from which originated Purva Rāga which by gradual development became transformed into Mahābhāva which is again represented by Rādhā. This is a book on Sahajiyā poetics.

N.B.—A book of the same name has been noticed in section IX.

XLII. (a) A nameless manuscript. University manuscript No. 601. Substance, country-made paper, 11×4 inches in size. Folia, seven (incomplete). Lines, eight in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of the script cannot be found as the manuscript is incomplete. The book is entirely written in prose.

(b) The name of the author cannot be known as the last pages are missing and there is no intermediate colophon.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণাভ্যাং নমঃ । অথ শ্রীরঙ্গ মন্দিরে সুখদর্শনং সদা কুৰ্য্যাৎ । সেভা অপার
নানা বৈভব সংযুক্ত । প্রেমময় পর্যাংতেক অভিনব সুকুমার শ্রীশ্রী.....বিরাজেন
বেস বয়স রূপ প্রেমমুখ রসের দৃষ্টান্ত বাহাতে নাই কেবল রস সাক্ষাৎ সুর্ভিমান ।

The end .—

অতঃপর যই বে পরস্পরের বিমল প্রেম রসাস্বাদ তুহার নাম মন্ত উহার নাম মন্ত
পূজা জপ ধ্যান আস সেবা যত কিবিতজ্জোকিকা লোকিক সকলী আই আবাদ
অতঃপর.....(incomplete).

(d) There is nice description of Kṛṣṇa receiving the offerings of the Gopis while seated in a parlour with Piyāri, the rival of Rādhā in Kṛṣṇa's love.

N.B.—The prose of this book is elegant and the sentences are longer than those found in books like Caitanyarupa Prāpti noticed in section X. The book seems to be the work of an author hailing from the Eastern Bengal, for there are verbs like করা, ফিরায়া peculiar to that part of the country.

XLIII. (a) **Kṛṣṇa Bhakti Parāyana Grantha.** University manuscript No. 602. Substance, country-made paper, 14 × 5 inches in size. Folia, three. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The book is written in prose throughout.

(b) The name of the author is not given.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ চরন স্বরনং । অথ আত্মা.....তটস্থ জিব । থাকেন কোথা
ভাণ্ডে ভাণ্ড কিরূপে হইলঃ তমবস্ত হইতে হইল ।

The end :—

মাধজ্য প্রধান । অসজ্য প্রকট । প্রকটরূপে নিত্য বেহার । অতএব মাধজ্য
নাই । একা সেই কৃষ্ণ নাম সদা জপ মোনে মন । গুরুরূপে অবতীর্ণ নাম সঙ্কীৰ্ত্তন ।
শ্রীজিব গোস্বামি বিরচিতায়াং বস্ত্র নির্জাস সমাপ্তয় । অতএব কৃষ্ণনাম আশ্রিত জন
সদা কৃতার্থ । ইতি শ্রীকৃষ্ণভক্তি পরায়ণ গ্রন্থ সংপূর্ণ ॥

(d) The subject treated in this book has a similarity with that of Deha Kaḍacā noticed in section XXXVII.

N.B.—In the concluding paragraph the name of the book is undoubtedly Kṛṣṇa Bhakti Parāyana. What then is the meaning of the sentence শ্রীজিব গোস্বামি বিরচিতায়াং বস্ত্র নির্জাস সমাপ্তয় ? This perhaps means that the book was written on the model of বস্ত্র নির্ঘ্যাস of Jiva Goswāmi. This বস্ত্র means দেহ, and hence the subject treated resembles that of the Deha Kaḍacā by Narottama Dāsa.

XLIV. (a) **Ratnajijnāsā.** University manuscript No. 603. Substance, country-made paper, 10 × 5 inches in size. Folia, four. Lines, fifteen in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1278 B.S., corresponding to 1872 A.D. The book is written in simple prose.

(b) The name of the author is not given.

(c) The beginning⁹:

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ । রত্নজিজ্ঞাসা । তুমিকে আমি জীব । কুন জিব ॥ থাকেন
কথা ভাঙে ॥ ভাণ্ড কিকপে হইল । তত্তবস্ত হইতে হইল ।

The end :

সামঞ্জসা দ্বারকায় লক্ষী শুনকি পতি ভাব । সাধারণি মথুরায় কুজা শুনকি নিজ
সুখ বাঞ্ছা । ইতি লিখিতং শ্রীগোপাল চন্দ্র গোস্বামী সাঃ সলদাগাম আখড়ায় সমাপ্তং ।
পাঠক শ্রীসাক্ষবিস্ম গোস্বামী সাঃ নলবুনি শামসুন্দরপুর । সন ১২৮৭ সাল তাঃ ২১
বৈশাখ বুধবার ।

(d) This is the same book noticed in sections XXXVII and XLIII. This shows that the same subject has been treated in books bearing different names.

XLV. (a) **A nameless manuscript.** University manuscript No. 606. Substance, country-made paper, $13 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, nine (incomplete). Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of the script can not be found as the last pages are missing. The verses are Payāra mixed with prose and occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author cannot be found.

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণভ্যাং নমঃ । অহং কনক কেতকিকুসুম গৌর.....অথ চৈতন্ত
চৈতন্ত । অথ চৈতন্তরূপ চৈতন্তঃ অথ গুরুরূপ চৈতন্তঃ অথ প্রকাশ চৈতন্তঃ ।
প্রকাশ চৈতন্তের এবে করিএ গনন । সাধকরূপে সেই জীলা কৈলা আশ্বাদন ।

The end :

কেমনরূপে^{১০} আছ তুমী করি নিবেদন । পছাতে কহিব ইহা কর আশ্বাদন ।
কামহেতু মত্ত হস্তি বন্দি কারাগারে । ক্রোধ হেতু মত্ত সিংহ কুপে পসি মরে ॥ লোভ
হেতু পতঙ্গ প্রদিপে ছাড়ে প্রাণেঃ ।

(d) After invocations to the renowned Vaiṣṇavas, the author maintains that Caitanya tasted love (Rasa) just as Caṇḍī Dāsa and Vidyāpati did. He then speaks about different Sarovaras (ponds) with their special characteristics. The descriptions of various lotuses, nerves and worlds, etc., show that the Sahajiyās, though imitating the Tantras, tried to evolve a nerve theory in their own way. The book ends after pointing out the relation between Ātmā and Paramātmā.

XLVI. (a) **Sahajatattva Grantha.** University manuscript No. 607. Substance, country-made paper, $13\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, nine. Lines vary from nine to twelve in a page. Character,

Bengali. The script is dated 1230 B.S., corresponding to 1824 A.D. The verses are Payāra mixed with prose and occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b). The name of the author is Radhā Vallabha Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীকৃষ্ণ রঘুনাথ পদে জার আস ।
সহজতত্ত্ব কহেন শ্রীরাধাবল্লভ দাষ ॥

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণ । চৈতন্তচন্দ্রায় নমঃ ॥ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত সচিস্থত সৌর ভগবান । জয় জয় নিত্যানন্দ সর্বজিব প্রান ॥ জয় অদ্বৈত গোসাঞি রূপার সাগর । দশে তুন ধরি দেহ প্রেম ভক্তিবর ॥ জয় ভক্তবিন্দ জয় জয় হরিদাস । মো পাপিরে কৃপা করি কর নিজ দাস ॥

The end :—

সেই গুনে মরে সেই গুনে জিএ সেই গুনে পাগল । সেই গুনে বন্দী হইল রসিক সকল ॥ বিন্দাবনে সয়ং রাধা রাধিকার গুরু । রাধারাদিকা নাম প্রেম কল্লতরু ॥ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ রঘুনাথ পদে জার আস । সহজতত্ত্ব কহেন শ্রীরাধাবল্লভ দাষ । ইতি সহজতত্ত্ব সম্পূর্ণ । অথা দিষ্টং তথা লিখিতং লিখ্যে ক দোস নাস্তীক । সন ১২৩০ সাল । তারিখ ২ আসাদ ।

(d) After invocations to the renowned Vaiṣṇavas the author speaks about different kinds of Guru adopted by a worshipper during his Prabarta, Sādhaka and Siddha stages. Then he deals with the characteristic of different Āśrayas, and of Bhāba, Prema, Rati, etc. Then come the descriptions of Vṛndābana and its classifications, of the nine kinds of Bhakti, and of Vaidhi and Rāgānugā love. Then the author says that the mode of Sahajiyā culture is union with a woman through love, just like the union of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.

XLVII. (a) Ātma Jijñāsā. University manuscript No. 610. Substance, country-made paper, 10 × 3½ inches in size. Folia, five. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1242 B.S., corresponding to 1836 A.D. The book is written in prose mixed with Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Kṛṣṇa Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীগোরাঙ্গ । অথ আত্মজিজ্ঞাসা লিখ্যতে । তুমি কে । আমি জিব কোন জিব । তটস্থ জিব । থাকো কোথা । ভাণ্ডে : ভাণ্ড তত্ত্ব বস্তু হইতে হইলো । তত্ত্ব বস্তু কি । etc.

The end :

অবশ্য মিলিবে তাহে নিত্যবুদ্ধারবন। আনন্দে সেবিবে সেই প্রভুর চরন ॥
সহচরি সহ আশাদিতে মোর চরন আশ। আত্মজিজ্ঞাসা সারাংসার কহেন শ্রীকৃষ্ণ-
দাস ॥ ইতি আত্মজিজ্ঞাসা সম্পূর্ণ। লিখিতং শ্রীরূপদাস নাড়া সাং রসোড়া পাটক
শ্রীবিষ্ণুরূপ দাস বৈরাগ্য সাং গুড়ের ডাঙ্গা ইতি সন ১২৪২ সাক আখিরি তারিখ
৩ বৈশাখ ॥

(d) The author speaks about Jiva (soul), Indriya (senses), Bhuta (elements), and the Trinity (Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva), who were created by Mahāviṣṇu, the supreme God, about three kinds of—Vṛndābana, and about Rasa which is said to be the very nectar of Sahajiyā culture.

N.B. Books dealing with similar subjects have been noticed in sections XLI V, XLIII and XXXVII.

XLVIII. (a) **Svarūpa Dāmodarera Kaḍacā.** University manuscript No. 614. Substance, country-made paper, 11×7 inches in size. Folia, 1-45, 47. Lines, vary from 11 to 12 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1259 B.S., corresponding to 1853 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is not expressly mentioned.

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ। বন্দেং শ্রীস লাবণ্য শ্রীরূপ তারল্য ধনং কলীযুগ সার কথিতং
কির্তনান্দ গিতঃ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্তদেবং জগদানন্দ প্রভাবং। ইতি। জয় জয় শ্রীকৃষ্ণ
চৈতন্ত রসরূপ। জয় জয় নিত্যানন্দ প্রেমের স্বরূপ ॥ জয় জয় অদ্বৈত প্রভু ভক্ত
অবতার। সদত মর্শ ভেদ করে জাহার হুঙ্কার ॥

The end :

রাগভক্ত বিনা ইহা না কর প্রকাশ। সাত্ত্বিক জনের এই গ্রন্থে না হবে বিশাষ ॥
শ্রীচৈতন্ত নিত্যানন্দ কহিল দুইজনে। দামোদর স্বরূপ কহে শ্লোক ব্যাখ্যানে ॥ ইতি
শ্রীনবরসিক লিলাতত্ত্ব বর্ণনে পরপুরুষ বিচারে লিলারস কখনে অষ্টম রূপ গ্রন্থ সমাপ্ত।
ইত্যষ্টমাংক গ্রন্থ সমাপ্ত-শ্রাং। ইতি সন ১২৫৯ সাল তারিখ ১৭ ভাদ্র দ্বিতীয়া।

(d) The whole book is divided into eight chapters. In the first the author treats about the characteristic of different Āśrayas, in the second about Bhāva and Prema, in the third about Rasa, in the fifth about Rupa, in the sixth about six Rāgas, in the seventh about the lovers like Caṇḍī Dāsa, Vidyāpati and others, and in the eighth about the Rasiks and their characteristics. The author repeatedly says that it is a translation of the well-known Kaḍacā of Svarūpa Dāmodara, and that he wrote the work under inspiration from Caitanya Deva. He uses the word “Rūpa” for each chapter.

XLVIII (a) Rasakalpa Latikā. University manuscript No. 615. Substance, country-made paper, $13 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, four. Lines, vary from ten to eleven in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1266 B.S., corresponding to 1860 A.D. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The author of the book is Locana Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীনরহরি পাদপদ্ম করি মনে আস ।
রসকল্প লতিকা হৈএ লোচন দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণায় নমঃ । বন্দে শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত প্রেমামৃত তরু স্বয়ং । রাধা-ভাব সমান্তায় ভক্তানুগ্রহ করনং ॥ বন্দে শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত স্বয়ংভূগবান । তোমার পদারব্দে ভক্তি দেহ দান ॥ শ্রীগুরু চরনারব্দ ভরসা কেবল । যাহা হৈতে প্রেম ভক্তি পাইএ সকল ॥

The end :

অপ্রাকৃত মানুষ রতি জিবে না সম্ভবে । উত্তমদ্বারা পাত্র হইলে পছন্দ জানাইবে । এইত সংক্ষেপে আমি কহিল আভাস । দেস কাল পাত্র দ্বারায় ইহার প্রকাশ । শ্রীনরহরি পাদপদ্ম করি মনে আস । রসকল্প লতিকা হৈএ লোচন দাস । ইতি রসকল্পলতিকা গ্রন্থ সংপূর্ণ । ইতি সন ১২৬৬ সাল তারিখ ৫ পোস ।

(d) After invocations the author introduces the subject in the form of instruction given by Rāmānanda to Svarūpa. The subjects treated are Āśrayas, Prabarta, etc., and Prema, Rāga and other allied discourses.

L. (a) Siddhānta Candrodaya. University manuscript No. 616. Substance, country-made paper, 8×5 inches in size. Folia, 42. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1268 B.S., corresponding to 1862 A.D. The verses are Payāra mixed with Tripadi and copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The author of the book is perhaps Muknnda Dāsa who puts himself in colophon as—

কবিরাজ গোস্বামির পাদপদ্ম করি ধ্যান ।
তাহার রূপাতে ক্ষুরে এসব সন্ধান ॥

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ জয়তি । কস্তরি মঞ্জরি বন্দে: কৃষ্ণপ্রাণবল্লভা: নৃত্যাদি গুন-সংশোভা: রাধিকা: প্রিয় সঙ্গীনি: । রূপ রঘুনাথ সনাতন: ভক্তীজোগ: শ্রীজীব গুরু গোষ্ঠীগণ ॥ পয়ার । তা শভার পাদপদ্ম ধরো সিরোপরি । তা শভার গুন গাঙ মন বাহা ভোরি ।

The end :

আমি অযোগ্য ভক্তীর যোগ্য নোই। কৃপা করি সকলে আমার অপরাধ লবে নাই। আমি অতি শূদ্রমতি না জানি সাধন। সতে মেলি কৃপা কর পাই জেন ত্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণের চরন। ইতি সন ১২৬৮ সাল তারিখ ৩১ ভাদ্র লিখক শ্রী (মধব) চন্দ্র মুখোপাধ্যায়। এই গ্রন্থ বানসী-দক্ষিণপাড়ায় আগড়াধারি শ্রীল শ্রীযুক্ত গৌরদাস ঠাকুরের আর আমরা সকলে উহারি আশ্রিত।

(d) The book is divided into eight chapters. The first chapter deals with the different manifestations of Kṛṣṇa,—his love amours with Rādhā, and his partial manifestations in Vāsudeva, Saṅkaraṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha. The second chapter deals with the three potentialities of God, namely, the inter potentiality manifested in joy, the good potentiality from which can be known the nature of God, and the Jñāna potentiality which clears up the knowledge of God. The third chapter deals with knowledge about Brahma, while the fourth about Avidheya (অবিধেয়), i.e., about Vaidhi and Rāgānugā love. The fifth is devoted to the discussion of Rati under two heads, Svakiyā and Parakiyā. The sixth deals with Āropa (আরোপ) where-in is stated the nature of various Āśrayas and of Bhāba, Prema, etc. The seventh says how God can be attained by means of Rāga (love). The eighth is an elaborate chapter dealing with varieties of subjects, such as Ragā Bhakti, Prema Bhakti, etc., supported by innumerable quotations from various Sanskrit works.

LI. (a) Rāgānugāvidhi Tattva Jijñāsā. University manuscript No. 618. Substance, country-made paper, 12×4½ inches in size. Character, Bengali. Folia, two. Lines, twelve in a page. The script is dated 1273 B.S., corresponding to 1867 A.D. The book is written in simple prose mixed with Tripadi at the end.

(b) The name of the author is Rasika Rāja (?).

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণভ্যাং নম। অথ রাগানুগাবিধিতত্ত্বজিজ্ঞাসাপত্রলিখতে। ভৌতিক দেহ কোন যন্ত্রগতে সিদ্ধঃ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত যন্ত্রগতে সিদ্ধঃ ॥ etc.

The end :

হাসি ২ ধনি বল্যে বিনদিনঃ য়নহে রসিকরাজ। আপন মনেরি করন সাধন কহিতে বাসিএ লাজ ॥ একক্ষরে কর ভজন সাধন মিলক্ষরে লেহ নাম ॥ অজপা জপিলে য়ামারে পাইবে য়নহে রসিক সাম ॥ ইতি রাগানুগাবিধিতত্ত্ব জিজ্ঞাসা পত্র সমাপ্ত। জ্ঞানাদিষ্টং.....সন ১২৭৩ সাল তাঃ ২৭ পৌষ।

(d) The book deals with various Āśrayas, Bhakti, Rāga, Manjaris, etc.

LII. (a) **Sikṣā Tattva Dvīpikā**. University manuscript No. 623. Substance, country-made paper, $11\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ inches in size. Folia, 1-11 and 13. (incomplete). Lines, twelve in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1276 B.S., corresponding to 1870 A.D. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa who puts himself in the colophon as—

শ্রীশুরু বৈষ্ণব পদধনি করি আস।
সিদ্ধাতত্ত্বদীপিকা কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ। অথ সিদ্ধাতত্ত্বদীপিকা। পদধন্যঃ গুরুনবন্দে কৃপামোহ মহং
প্রভো। অজ্ঞেনন্দঃ বিনাসায় জ্ঞেনর্ভং জ্ঞেপীতং মনে॥ শ্রীশুরু বৈষ্ণব পদ স্বরন
কোরিআ। আশ্রয় নির্দেশ লিখি সুন মন দীআ।

The end :

সিদ্ধার্ভ দীপিকা এই ভজনের মত। শ্রদ্ধজুক্ত হয়ে যুন বৃজন ভকত ॥ ইথে
মর্থ জে কহিএ তাহা আচরিলে। বজের সহিত তবে রাধাকৃষ্ণ মীলে ॥ শ্রীশুরু বৈষ্ণব
পদধনি করি আস। সিদ্ধাতত্ত্ব দীপিকা কহে নরোত্তম দাস। ইতি সন ১২৭৬ সাল।
শ্রীশ্রীগোপী গোস্বামীর চরন ভরসা মার্ভঃ ॥

(d) The book begins with a discussion about Prabartā, Sādhaka and Siddha, about the characteristics of the love of Vṛndābana, and goes on speaking about lotuses, Manjaris, companions of Rādhā, Vaidhi and Rāgānugā love, Rasas, and about the Sahajiyā saints such as Caṇḍīdāsa, Vidyāpati and others, about the love amours of Kṛṣṇa with the Gopis, and other allied subjects.

LVII. (a) **Nigama Grantha**. University manuscript No. 1118. Substance, country-made paper, $13 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, 2-7. Lines, vary from 12 to 13 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1061 B.S., corresponding to 1655 A. D. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author is Govinda Dāsa.

(c) The beginning of the second page :

প্রভু বলেন মোর দেহ প্রেমে পূর্ণময় ॥ কহেন নারদ যুনি শুন ভগবান।
সবাকার প্রেম তুমি তুমি বল আন ॥ সবার হৃদয় তুমি গোলোক ইশ্বর। তুমি
বল প্রেমে মোর না পুরে অন্তর ॥

The end :

দৃঢ় করি ধর ভাই বৈষ্ণব গোসাঞি। সকল ভুবনে বড় আর কেহ নাই ॥
বড়র আশ্রয় দেখি হয় জেই জন। যুগযুগান্তরে দুখ না পায় কখন ॥ ইহা জানি

ভজ ভাই জার জেবা ইচ্ছা । কেবল কৃষ্ণের নাম আর সব মিথ্যা ॥ শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্ত
নিত্যানন্দ অবতারে । কলিয়ুগে প্রেমদানে তারিল সভারে ॥ ইতি শ্রীনিগম গ্রন্থ
সারতত্ত্ব সমাপ্ত । সন ১০৬১ সাল তারিখ ১৯ আশ্বীন ।

(d) The book begins by narrating how Kṛṣṇa was born in Navadvīpa in the form of Caitanya Deva in order to 'aste the love of Rādhā. Later on Navadvīpa is identified with Vṛndāvana, both of which are said to be the favourite abodes of Kṛṣṇa. Towards the end there is a dialogue between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā about love which is said to be more precious than anything else. Gour in the Kali age is like Vṛndāvana of the Dvāpara age.

LVIII. (a) **Durlava Sāra.** University manuscript No. 1138. Substance, country-made paper, 13 × 4½ inches in size. Folia, 35. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1195 B. S., corresponding to 1789 A. D. The verses are Payāra with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Locana Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণভ্যাং নমঃ । ভক্তি প্রেম মহার্য রত্ননিকর ত্যাগেন সন্তোষ
অনভক্তানুজনতি প্রতিবিধৌপূর্ণাবতির্যকলৌ ।..... এক নিবেদন করি শুন সর্বজন ।
বাচাল করত্র গোরা শুনে মুকজন ॥ কহিতে কহিতে নাহি জানি নিজপর ।
জে উঠএ তাহি বলি ন উঠএ ডর ॥ etc.

The end :

এই জে করিল ক্রিড়া এই অনুগ্রহ । ইহায় বলিবা মায়াতেই অবগ্রহ ॥ সতে
জানে কৃপা বিসেস ভক্তজনে ! মায়াতে মুগধ তেই সন্দেহ ধরি মনে ॥ আমার
বচনে তুমি করহ বিশ্বাস । আনন্দ হৃদয়ে কহে এ লোচন দাস ॥ ইতি দুর্লভ সার গ্রন্থ
সম্পূর্ণ । জখাদৃষ্টং etc. সন ১১৯৫ সাল ২৪ আশাঢ় ॥

(d) In the beginning the author says that Viṣṇu in all His incarnations, except those of Kṛṣṇa and Caitanya, followed the customary Vedic practices, but in these isolated two cases he was guided by love unfettered by any social custom. So Kṛṣṇa of the Dvāpara age is identical with Caitanya of the Kali age. Then the author speaks about the characteristics of Rasa Bhakti and Prema Bhakti. The former ascribes everything to God, while the latter forgets himself for the love of god, whose separation is even extremely painful. Rādhā symbolises this love. Here all sorts of social formalities have no place. In imitation of this love, man and woman should love each other with great fervour, and when both of them lose self, the love between them is said to be Sahajiyā love.

In this book there is a family history of the author given by himself. He says he was a Vaidya by caste and was born in Kograma. His father was Kamalākara and mother Sadānandī, whose father was Puruṣottama Datta who taught the author how to read and write. This is exactly the family history of Locana Dāsa as given by him in his celebrated work named Caitanya Maṅgala. The current belief is that the Sahajiyā books were not written by any renowned Vaiṣṇava author. Even the works of Narottama are ascribed to some other unknown Narottama who is believed to have written books in the name of his distinguished predecessor. The book under review furnishes authentic proof against that theory.

LIX. (a) *Ātmanirupana*. University manuscript No. 1140. Substance, country-made paper, 13×5 inches in size. Folia, 1-5 (incomplete). Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of the script cannot be found as the last page is missing. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author can not be found.

(c) The beginning :

শ্রীশ্রীকৃষ্ণ । অথো আত্মা নিরূপণ । জয় জয় শ্রীচৈতন্ত্য ভকত হৃদয় । জয় ২
শ্রীচৈতন্ত্য বৈষ্ণবের ভূপ । গুরু কৃষ্ণ বৈষ্ণব তিন এক রূপ ॥

The end :

শতদল পদ্ম আছে হৃদয় মন্দিরে । সতত হইতে আসি তাহা লিলা করে ॥
নাভিতলে আছে পদ্ম শতদল । রূপ রতি রস তার করে বলমল ॥

(d) In spiritual culture one should first of all know his own body. This body of ours contains everything within itself. Fourteen worlds, the sun, moon, stars, heat and light, darkness, etc., have been located in different organs. The theory of various nerves and lotuses has also been adopted by the author.

N.B. We have another manuscript bearing the same name in the University Library (No. 2535). On comparison we find that these two books are identical. The name of the author of that book is Kṛṣṇa Dāsa. So, we believe that he is the author of this book also.

LX. (a) *Āśraya Tattva*. University manuscript No. 1141. Substance, country-made paper, 14×5 inches in size. Folia, six. Lines vary from 10-11 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1257 B.S., corresponding to 1857 A.D. The book is written in Payāra, and Tripadi intermixed with simple prose.

(b) The name of the author is Rūpanārāyaṇa.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণায় নমঃ । প্রথমে আশ্রয় হয় শ্রীরূপ চরণ । তবে নামাশ্রয় হয়
অনুবঙ্গগণ ॥ হরিনাম মহামন্ত্র চারিবেদে সার । নামাশ্রয় হয় এই কহিল নিদ্বার ॥

The end :—

চণ্ডিদাশ বিদ্যাপতিঃ রামচিন্তামনি আদিঃ পদ্মাবতি লছিমা সনে । লীলাশুক
বসি একা সনে । রূপ নারায়ণ শিব সিংহ । বেদ পুত্র রতিবান ভূঙ্গ ॥ পত্নের সুখা
চারি পত্নেতে আশ্রয় করিঃ শিবসিংহ মহাভোর । ইতি—শ্রীআশ্রয় তত্ত্ব নব রসিকের
পদ সমাপ্ত । ইতি—ভীমস্বাপি, etc., ১২৫৭ সাল তা ২৮ জ্যৈষ্ঠ । একুনে ছয় পাত ॥

(d) In the beginning, the author deals with Gāyatri and Dikṣa Mantra. Then he says that the devotee should follow spiritual culture by adopting a woman as his companion. This is called the worship of God by adopting the sentiment of love (মাধুর্য্যভাব). Then he says that the celebrated nine mystic worshippers, such as, Bidyāpati, Caṇḍidāsa, Līlā Suka, etc., attained Siddhi (reached the goal) by adopting this mode of spiritual culture.

LXI. Vraja Tattva Nivarta. University manuscript No. 1154. Substance, country-made paper, 11 × 5½ inches in size. Folia, 1-15. Lines twelve in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1082 B. S. corresponding to 1676 A.D. The verses are Payāra with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is not given, but the last page of the manuscript says that the book was written on the model of a book named Vraja Tattva written by Rūpa Goswāmi under inspiration from Rādhā.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য । ব্রজতত্ত্ব নিবর্ত । জীবতানুরাধিকা দেহং কৃষ্ণস্ত আশ্রিতং
ভবেৎ । সত্যাক্রোদ্ধাপরং জাতং ইবেন চৈতন্যরূপে রাধিকায়া প্রেমশিক্ষা
নিত্য বৃন্দাবনং পুরিং ।

The end :—

এ তত্ত্ব ব্রজনিবর্ত শ্রীরূপ বিরচিতং শ্রীরাধিকা-মনবাঞ্ছা পূর্ব্বপরং স্থিতং শ্রীরাধিকে
রিদি কস্তরে ॥ ছয় তিন নয় সেস মদ্রে দুই একেতে রএ চতুর বিংসতি চৈতন
রূপেতে ভক্ত কন্দরে সেস পক্ষান্তরে লিলাভক্ত অন্তরে এই গ্রন্থে উদ্ধাহ ভবেৎ ।
ইতি শ্রীব্রজতত্ত্বনিবর্ত সংপূর্ণ । জথা দিষ্টীত ইত্যাদি । ইতি সন ১০৮২ সাল তা
৩ কার্তিক ।

(d) The book aims at the interpretation of the significance of the love amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, of the various incarnations of God in the four ages, of the incarnation of Caitanya Deva, and of Sahajiyā culture in the complete union of man and woman.

LXII. (a) *Ripu Caritra*. University manuscript No. 2824, Substance, country-made paper, $11 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, four. Lines, vary from 12 to 13 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations, the 1st and the last pages are worm-eaten.

(b) The name of the author is Vrindāvana Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—

.....লিতং জেন তসৌ শ্রীগুরুবে নমঃ ।.....তিমির নাস চক্ষুদান হয়
জাহা হৈতে । লক্ষ্যাবদ.....রিপু চরিত্র গ্রহ্ম হ্নন মন দিয়া ॥ শ্রীগুরু বৈষ্ণবের
পদধূলী নিয়া । কহিব ... কথা চৈতন্ত্য ভাবিয়া ॥ etc.

The end :—

জ্ঞেজন এরাবে ভাই সমনের দায় । কুটীনাটি ছারি ভাই ভজ রাঙ্গা পায় ॥
শ্রীগোবিন্দ ভাই.....দাস বুদ্ধাবন । রিপু চরিত্র গ্রহ্ম কৈলা সমাপন ॥ ইতি রিপু
চরিত্র গ্রহ্ম সম্পূর্ণ । লিখক শ্রীনাথ মণ্ডল ।.....

(d) The author says that Caitanya by preaching Harināma brought about the salvation of all. This frightened Yama, the God of Death. He was, however, consoled by his six sons, the gods of six senses. They told their father that a man, in spite of his earnest devotion, cannot obtain salvation unless he subdues his six senses. For this purpose a man should serve his Guru with such devotion as was done by Rādhā in serving Kṛṣṇa. A devotee is to the Guru as Rādhā was to Kṛṣṇa. Herein comes the justification of the theory that a man cannot get salvation until he assumes the character of a woman. This is one of the pet theories of the Sahajiyās.

LXIII. (a) *Sahaja Kalikā*. University manuscript No. 2828. Substance, country-made paper, $11\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, four. Lines, seven in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1184 B.S. corresponding to 1778 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author is Jiva Goswāmī,

(c) The beginning :—

জয় রূপ সনাতন ভজন ভাবনা । সহজ করুনা বস্তু তাহার বর্ণনা । সহজ
বোলিতে প্রেম আনন্দ উদ্ভব হয় । সহজ পিরিতি প্রেম কার বস নয় ॥ সহজ ভজিতে
পারে শক্তি আর কার । শ্রীরূপ করুনা রূপা পূর্ব সমকার ॥

The end :—

সহজ বস্তু উপাসনা জাগিঙ ভালমতে । গোলোক হইতে লিলা বস্তু প্রকাশিতে ॥
কতক হইল ইতি গনন না জায় । রতিনুত গোলোক তায় লিলায় সহায় ॥ এই
বস্তু বিত্তা বস্তু উপাসনা নাঞি । সহজ কালিকা কৈল শ্রীজিব পোষাঞি । ইতি—
সহজ কালিকা সম্পূর্ণ ॥ সন ১১৮৪ সাল ইতি তা ৩ অগ্রান রোজ সমবার ॥

(d) This is properly a book on Sahajiyā poetics. The Sahajiyā love is based upon principally three emotions, Rūpa, Rāga and Rati. Then the author describes various Manjaris or Sakhis of Rādhā and how they help the formation of true love. Sahajiyā love is nothing else than divine love, as exists in the highest heaven where resides the Supreme Lord.

LXIV. (a) **Cabbis Vidhāna Prakaraṇa.** University Manuscript No. 3099. Substance, country-made paper, 11 × 5 inches in size. Folia, three. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1275 B.S. corresponding to 1869 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author is not given.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীগৌরু নিত্যানন্দ জয়তি চন্দ্রায় নমঃ । ক্লিং কামদেবায়ঃ বিত্তহে পুশাবানার
ধিমহি তর্ল্লঙ্গ প্রচন্দয়াৎ । কাঃ পদে কাম হইতে বিজের উৎপতি । তাহারতে বিত্তোল
প্রেম সাধন পিরিতি ॥

The end :—

আঃ পদে আফ্লাদিনী শ্রীরাধিকা আপনে । শ্রীকৃষ্ণকে আফ্লাদে সদা কায়বাকা
মনে ॥ ২৩ অঙ্ক অক্ষর পূর্ণচন্দ্র ললাঠে উজ্জলি । অক্ষকারে বলমল কোটা চন্দ্র জিনি
২৪ বিধান প্রকরণ লিখ্যতি ইতি সন ১২৭৫ সাল তা ২৪ মাহ বৈসাখ লিখিতং
শ্রীলোচন দাশ বৈষ্ণব ঠাকুর পঠার্ধে জথা তথাচ ।

(d) The book begins by referring to what is called the Kāma Gāyatri, a mantra of 24 alphabets. Later on the author describes the spiritual significance of each of these 24 alphabets. These are 24 Tattvas, after which the book is named.

LXV. Camatkāra Caṇḍrikā. University manuscript No. 3098. Substance, country-made paper, 11 × 5 inches in size. Folia, six. Lines, fourteen in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণায় নমঃ ॥ শ্রীচোমৎকার চন্দ্রিকা লিখিতং । অজামূলস্থিত ভুজোঃ
ইত্যাদি । শ্রীরূপ সনাতন ভট্ট রঘুনাথ । শ্রীজিব গোপাল ভট্ট দাস রঘুনাথ ॥

The end :—

শ্রীরূপ মঞ্জরি পাদ পদ্ম করি আশ । চোমৎকার চন্দ্রিকা (ক) হেন শ্রীনরোত্তম
দাস ॥ ইতি শ্রীচোমৎকার চন্দ্রিকা সম্পূর্ণ । এই গ্রন্থ জে শুনিবে সাবধানে ।
অল্পদিনে মিলে রাধা কৃষ্ণের চরণে ॥.....সাধন বরন যোর সেই রূপ ধ্যান । কৃপা
করি বালকেরে কর পরিভ্রান ॥ লিখিতং শ্রীমোহনদাস বৈরাগি । শ্রীচোমৎকার চন্দ্রিকা
গ্রন্থ সম্পূর্ণ ইতি ।

(d) A book of the same name has already been noticed in section LVI. The author of that book is Mukunda Dāsa, but of this one, is Narottama Dāsa. Moreover these two books treat about different subjects. The author gives preference to Rasa over Bhāva, for, by adopting the latter one can get Rādhā, while by adopting the former, both Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. Thereafter follow descriptions of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. True love can be obtained by worshipping God with the emotion of Rādhā.

LXVI. Manovṛtti Paṭala. University manuscript No. 2861. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 5 inches in size. Folia, six. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations. The book is worm-eaten, a portion of the left side in the form of a triangle being eaten away.

(b) The name of the author is Kṛṣṇa Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—

.....নমঃ শ্রীমহা প্রভুর মন বিত্তি পোটল লিখিতে । অজ্ঞান ত্রিমিরাক্ত
জ্ঞানাজনশলাকায় চক্ষুরান্নি..... নমঃ । জয় ২ শ্রীচৈতন্য জয় নিত্যানন্দ । জয়াধৈতচন্দ্র
জয় গউর তত্ত্ব বিন্দ ।

The end :—

কহিলাম সহজতত্ত্ব ভাইরে নিতাই। আজ্ঞা হৈলে অভিপ্রায় শ্রীহৃদ্যবনে জাই ॥
কহিতে বলিতে দুই ভাই পুলকিত। রজনী শোমধা হেল তপন উদিত ॥ জনমে
জনমে রাধা কৃষ্ণ পদে আধ। মোনবিত্তি পোটল কহে শ্রীকৃষ্ণ দাধ। ইতি মোনবিত্তি
পোটল সোমাপ্ত ॥

(d) The author begins the book in the form of a dialogue between Nitāi and Caitanya, when the latter was about to start for Vraja. He instructed Nitāi to teach Prema Bhakti in Navadvipa, and being asked what it was, he said that it represents the love of Gopi. Nitāi asked how it was possible for a man to adopt the emotions of a woman. Caitanya answered that men and women are different externally but in fact they are the two halves of the same complete whole, and then he recited five slokas dealing with this subject. He then pointed out the superiority of Parakiyā love.

LXVII. **Rati Bheda.** University manuscript No. 3119. Substance, country-made paper, $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, two (the second and the fourth page of the book, the rest missing). There are eleven lines in the second page and eight in the fourth. The script is dated 1190 B.S. corresponding to 1784 A.D. The book is written in prose and Payāra with scanty Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is not given.

(c) The beginning (of the second page) :—

বৈধিভক্তি করে বলি। না। বৈধি ভক্তি বুলি করে। না। চৌষটি আঙ্গাভক্তি।
ইহার দ্বারে গোলক প্রাপ্তি। আর ভাব ভক্তি। ভাবের বিজাতি হইলে মথুরা দ্বারকা
প্রাপ্তি। etc.

The end :—

রতি পঞ্চ। সঙ্কুল ১ কেবলা ২ সামর্থ্য ৩ সমঞ্জস ৪ সাধারণ ৫ ॥ এক স্থানে
সকল সম্ভব হয় ॥ কর্ণ নেত্র নাসিকা মুখ রোমান্দ। এই পঞ্চ ইতি রতি ভেদ সংপূর্ণ।
গৌর মোহন শর্মা সাং গোপিনাথপুর। সাল ১১৯০ সাল প্রাতে সংপূর্ণ।

(d) This is a book on Sahajiyā poetics. It begins by touching upon the 64 qualifications of the Vaidhi Bhakti, five kinds of Rati, five kinds of Rasa, five kinds of Rāga and five kinds of Bhāva. The devotees of Sānta Rasa are Sanaka, Sonātana, Sanatkumāra, etc., those of Dāsya are Hanumāna, Angada, etc., those of

Sakhya are Sridāma, Sudāma, etc., those of Vātsalya are Nanda, Jasodā, etc., and those of Madhura are Rādhikā and the Gopis.

LXVIII. Paramatattva Artha Curnaka. University manuscript No. 3128. Substance, country-made paper, $14 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, three (the first page being missing). Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1246 B.S. corresponding to 1840 A.D. The verses are Payāra.

(b) The name of the author is not given.

(c) The beginning (of the second page) :—

—নিত্যতত্ত্ব কহিয়াছ মোরে । স্থানেতে কহিলে সব শক্ষ্য নাহি ক্ষুরে । স্থানে
নিত্যতত্ত্ব স্থনি মনে হর্ষ হয় । মুক্ষ্য না বুঝিয়া মন বিরস মানয় ॥ একারনে হরস
বিসাদ হয় মোর দেহ । পুন দয়া করি মুক্ষ বিচারিয়া কহ ॥

The end :—

এইত কহিল রূপ স্থন তত্ত্ব চূর্ণ । একবার স্থনিলে তার শাফল হয় জন্ম ।
যুনিয়া শ্রীরূপ ইহা আনন্দে ভাসিল । দোহে দোহার গলে ধরি স্তম্ভিত হইল ।
কতক্ষণ পরে দোহার স্থির হইল মন । দোহে দোহার নিজ স্থানে করিল গমন ॥
এত প্রতিত্ত্ব হইলে দুই মহাজনে । শে শব যুনিয়া আমি করি শোলক বন্দনে ।.....
ইতি পরম তত্ত্ব অর্থচূর্ণক সমাপ্ত ইতি সন ১২৪৬ সাল ।

(d) The book is written in the form of a dialogue between Rūpa and Svarūpa. The author aims at the mystic explanation of various Sahajiyā practices. The necessity of taking female companion is also explained. The significance of various mystic formula is pointed out. The poet incidentally deals with Prema (love), that is generated in the union of man and woman.

LXIX. Rasa Sutrāmṛta. University manuscript No. 3133. Substance, country-made paper, $8 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, 2-18, and 21-22 (incomplete). Lines vary from 7 to 8 in a page. Character, Bengali. The date of the script is not given. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Narasinha Dāsa who puts himself as the son of Bhāgyavanta Misra.

(c) The beginning (of the second page) :—

—রিল জত রসের বিস্তার ॥ মুঞি মুখ দিনহিন নহেঁ অধিজন । শ্লোকার্থ
বুঝিতে মুঞি নাহঙ ভাজন ॥ সাধুমুখে শুত্র অর্থ জে কিছু স্থনিল । শরাগ্র করিতে
আমী তাহা না পারিল ।

The end :—

শ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ নিলাপর্ণ অমৃতের সিদ্ধ । অনন্ত ব্রহ্মাণ্ড ভাসায় জার এক বিন্দু ॥
সাধুগণ আজ্ঞা কৈল কোরিঞা কোরুণা । ভাষাটিকা কৈল তাহে মুকু কণা ॥
আপনে রোচিল এই বৃথা অভিপ্রায় । শ্রীগুরু গৌরান্ন মোরে জে বোল বলায় ॥
ভাগ্যবন্ত মিশ্র পুত্র নরসিংহ দাস । রসহুত্রামৃত তাহা কোরিল প্রকাশ । ইতি
সাক্ষর শ্রীনন্দকুমার দাস ।

(d) The book deals with the characteristics of different kinds of men and women, and of Rati, both Svakiyā and Parakiyā, then there are descriptions of the various Sakhis of Rādhā. The development of pure love from coarse love is also traced, the characteristics of emotions such as Rāga, Prema, Bhāva, etc., have been noted in details.

LXX. *Rāga Lakṣmaṇa*. University manuscript No. 3134. Substance, country-made paper, 9×4 inches in size. Folia, ten. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra with copious Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is not given.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণগতি । আজ্ঞারুদ্ধিপনাদিপ্তঃ সাধকাদিতংপরং ক্রমাধিকার সজ্ঞিপ্তে
বিধী স্তৈ সিদ্ধি কিঞ্চিৎ । কথায়ামি স্তথাবপ্যং স্থানকুঞ্জাদ নিৰ্ণয়ং রতি ভেদা-
বভেদবত ক্রমপ্রাপ্তিং যথোচিতং ॥ স্বকিয়া পরকিয়া বৈধা রাগভক্ত্যাদি লক্ষণং ।
কাম সম্বন্ধ রূপাদি রাগ বৈধী নিরূপণং ॥

The end :—

বৈধী ভক্তি বিবরণ সংক্ষেপে কহিল । গ্রহণ বারণ দুই ক্রমে জানাইল ॥ তথা
রাগ । ব্রজবাসি যনের স্বভাব ধর্ম রাগ । অতি সুনির্মল তাথে নাহি কোন দাগ ।
সংসার সম্বন্ধে দুখ যত ॥

(d) The author deals with various Āśrayas, Rāgas, Bhāvas and Prema with their classifications and qualifications. The growth of emotions is also traced. Rāgānugā love is said to be superior to Vaidhi love. As the former can be best learnt from a woman, a female companion should be taken in spiritual culture. Then the three kinds of Ratis are described with their characteristics, naming the woman who adopted each of them for union with Kṛṣṇa. Then the author deals with Svakiyā and Parakiyā love,

and the different kinds of Bhaktas (devotees). The book ends after dealing with Vaidhi Bhakti.

LXXI. Ujvalera Kirāṇa. University manuscript No. 3100. Substance, country-made paper, 12×4 inches in size. Folia, 2-20. Lines, six in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1234 B.S. corresponding to 1828 A.D. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is Narasinha Dāsa, who puts himself as the son of Bhāgyamanta Misra.

(c) The beginning (of the second page) :—

স্বত্র অর্থ জে কিছু স্থানিল। সমগ্র করিতে আমি তাহা না পারিল ॥ সহবাস
বৈষ্ণবের যত্নের কারণ। দেব ভাসায় কিছু করিএ রচন ॥ জাহা প্রতি মহাপ্রভুর
পরম করুণা। রাগ মার্গে উপযুক্ত হয় সেই জনা ॥

The end :—

ভাগ্যবন্ত মিশ্র পুত্র নরসিংহ দাশ। রসসুত্রামিত্ত—না করিল প্রকাশ ॥ ইতি
উজ্জলের কিরণ সমাপ্ত। সাক্ষর শ্রীজগন্নাথ দেবশর্মা। পাঠার্থ শ্রীপদ্মলোচন
দেবশর্মা। সাং আইহো। সন ১২৩৪। যথাদৃষ্টমিত্যাদি ॥

(d) This is the same book named *Rasasutrāmṛita* which has been noticed in section LXIX. It should be noted that this book has been named as *Ujvalera Kirāṇa* in the margin of every folio, as well as in the end of the script. The date of the script is found in this copy, with the name of the writer and his address.

LXXII. Dilkitāb. University manuscript No. 3102. Substance, country-made paper, 11×4½ inches in size. Folia, nine. Lines vary from 7 to 9 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1280 B.S. corresponding to 1874 A.D. The verses are Payāra, sometimes elongated to unusual length.

(b) The name of the author is not given, but from the repeated use of the words like Macca, Madinā, Khodā, etc., it can be easily conjectured that the author of the book must be a Mahomedan.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণায় নমঃ। শ্রীকৃপ শোনাতন মোর নিস্তার গোশাঁঞি। মাক্কা
মদিনার খবর জাহা হৈতে পাই। রাত্রি শেষে একত্রে বোশীলা দুই ভাই।

দেহের খবর পুছেন রূপ শোনাতোনের ঠাই ॥ লোহা কাঞ্চন থাক দগ্ধন একত্র
কোরিঞা । ছনিঞা আলাম পয়দা হৈলো কুন খানে রহিল গীঞা ॥

The end :—

কেহ বোলে অরে ভাই খানিক বঞা দেখি । কেহ কেহ বোলে ভাই, ক্যানে
কর ফাকি ॥ শ্রীরূপ গোস্বামি বোলে কি ভাব বাসিঞা । পাখি উরি গেলো
পীঞ্জরা রোহিল পোরিঞা ॥ ইতি শ্রীরূপ শোনাতন গোস্বামির ধর সংবাদ উক্তি
সমাপ্তঃ । ইতি । যথাদৃষ্টং । পাঠক শ্রীকোকীরচন্দ্র মজুমদার । সং গোপীনাথ
পুর । সন ১২৮০ তারিক ১৬ মাহো কার্তিক । রোজ শুক্রবার । তিথি দশমী ।
বেলা ১৥ ডের প্রহর ॥

(d) This is a very interesting book. We have already pointed out that the author must be a Mahomedan. The name of the book, as noted in the margin of some pages of the script, is *Dilketāb*, but towards the end the author says—“ইতি—শ্রীরূপ শোনাতন গোস্বামির ধর সংবাদ উক্তি সমাপ্তঃ” which shows that the name of the book (according to the subject it treats) is “ধর সংবাদ উক্তি” of *Rūpa* and *Sanātana*. Now, *ধর* means body, so the full title signifies that the book deals with the metaphysical significance of human body and soul narrated in the form of a dialogue between *Rūpa* and *Sanātana*, so it is a book like *Deha Kaḍacā* noted in section XXXVII and *Deha Nirṇaya* treated in section V. Again, *দিল* means heart, and may stand for soul also in this place. So *দিলকিতাব* means the book which deals with soul. This *Dilkitāb* and *Dhara Saṁvāda* refer to two complementary qualifications of our human existence. .

The author begins with the history of creation and refers to the theory of human birth. There is also a discussion about the relation existing between a Guru and his *Śiṣya*, about the nature of human soul which is kept in bondage due to *Māyā* or ignorance, but it is free by nature. When he says that there are five robbers and eleven thieves in body, he surely refers to the five senses, and eleven organs of knowledge. Here the author is entirely indebted to *Amṛtarasāvalī* noticed in section III.

LXXIII. *Sādhya Kaumudi*. University manuscript No. 3103. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 4½ inches in size. Folia, three. Lines, ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1261

B.S. corresponding to 1855 A.D. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author is Narottama Dāsa.—

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীহরি । জয়ন্ত পৌরাঙ্গ বলি চলিলা পশ্চিমে । প্রভুর নাম লঞা গোসাঞি
কোরিলা বিপ্রামে ॥ উন্নত হইঞা গোসাঞি চোলিতে লাগিলা । জাইঞা
শ্রীধ্বাধনে বাসাদি কোরিলা ।

The end :—

সোনাতন গোসাঞির ভজন অমৃত মধুর । জীবন তিন অক্ষর সাধে প্রভুর
আপন ॥ সাধ্য কোমদিনি কহে নরত্তম দাস । ইহা জানি ভজন কর জার জেই
আশ ॥ ইতি সাধ্যকোমদিনী সংপূর্ণ । লিখিতঃ শ্রীরাধাবিনদ সৰ্ম্মা সাক্ষিম আইহো ॥
পাঠক শ্রীমথুরানাথ দাশ । সং তথা সন ১২৬১ সাল সকাঙ্গা ১৭৭৬ তারিখ ২০
কার্তিক ।

(d) The Sahajiyās should take female companion for spiritual culture. The author of this book says that Sanātana attained success by observing mystic practices in the company of Karuṇā Bāi. The object of taking female companion is the suppression of senses without which no progress can be made in spiritual culture.

LXXIV. *Smarana Darpana*. University manuscript No. 3111. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 4 inches in size. Folia, seven. Lines, nine in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1672 Saka corresponding to 1750 A.D. The verses are Tripadi throughout.

(b) The name of the author is Rāmachandra Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণাভ্যাং নমঃ । অজ্ঞান তিমিরাক্ত জ্ঞানাজ্ঞান সলাকয়া । চক্ৰান্বলিতঃ
যেন তনৈঃ শ্রীগুরুবে নমঃ । প্রথমে বন্দিব গুরু, বাঙ্খা কল্পতরু, কৃষ্ণপ্রাপ্তির জে
হয়ে স্নন । অজ্ঞান তিমির নাসে, দিগু করে পরকাষে, বন্দো সেই চরণ অতুল ॥

The end :—

জয় রূপ সনাতন দেহ মোরে এই ধন ভূষণ করিব সব গায় । শ্রীগোপাল ভট্টের
পদ সেই মোর সম্পদ ইহা বিহু আর নাহি ভায় ॥ কেহ না করিহ রোস খেমিবা
আমার দোস জেন কহিবা নরের ভাষ । স্ননরে রসিক ভাই স্মরণ দঙ্গল এই জে

কহিল রামচন্দ্র দাস ॥ ইতি স্মরণ দর্শন গ্রন্থ সম্পূর্ণ । হরেন্দ্রীয় হরেন্দ্রীন্দ্র হরেন্দ্রীয়েব
কেশবঃ ইত্যাদি । ইতি সাক্ষাৎ ১৬৭২ সকে সৌর চৈত্রস্ত পঞ্চদশ দিবসে বুধবারে
শ্রীতে ইত্যাদি—ইতি সন ১১৫৬ সাল ।

(d) In this book the author identifies Guru with God and says that without the favour of Guru, no advance can be made towards success in the spiritual field. There is also description of the various Manjaris or Sakhis of Rādhā, one of whom must be followed for spiritual culture.

LXXV. *Kṛṣṇa Lilā Vilāsa*. University manuscript No. 3121. Substance, country-made paper, $12 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, eight. Lines vary from 10 to 11 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is dated 1253 B.S. corresponding to 1847 A.D. The verses are Payāra with occasional Sanskrit quotations.

(b) The name of the author is not given.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ । অথ কৃষ্ণনিলাবিলাস গ্রন্থ লিখ্যতে । প্রথমে বন্দিব গুরু
বৈষ্ণব গোসাঞী । গোউর ভগবান বন্দী অষ্টৈত নিতাই ॥ জয় জয় ভক্তগণ
জয় বৃন্দাবন । জয়২ রামানন্দ জাতি প্রাণধন । ব্রজাণ্ডের অগোচর রাধাকৃষ্ণ কথা ।
কেবা বা কহিতে পারে কাহার জগ্যতা ।

The end :—

নিচ বংসে জন্মিঞা উত্তম হয় মতি । ভক্তনের ফলে হয় গো—তে গতি ॥ উত্তম
হইয়া জদি করে নিচ কন্ড । কোটী কোটী জন্মে হয় বৃক্ষ জ্বনি জন্ম ॥.....
হইঞা ভজে গোবিন্দ চরণ । মুক্তি পদ হয় তার না হয় মরণ ॥ ইতি শ্রীকৃষ্ণ
.....সংপূর্ণ হইল । তাং ১২৫৪ সাল তারিখ ৫ পৌষ তিথি দাদশী ।
লিখক.....দাষ বাবাজী পাঠক শ্রীগগন দাষ ।

(d) The book begins in the form of a conversation between Śiva and Kṛṣṇa about the merits to be obtained by reciting the names of Rādhā. Then in answer to a question put by Nārada Kṛṣṇa says that there is no difference between Śiva and Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā and Pārvatī. Then Rādhā explains to Kṛṣṇa the origin of Kṛṣṇa-mantra and incidentally refers to the nerves and lotus theories. There is also a beautiful description about the union of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.

LXXVI. *Sādhaka Siddha*. University manuscript No. 2596. Substance, country-made paper, $12 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, twelve.

Lines vary from four to ten in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The verses are Payāra throughout.

(b) The name of the author is Shyāmānanda Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীগোবর্দ্ধনমাশ্রয়ে । তিন অক্ষরের বীজ তিন বর্ণ ধরে । নালনিলপীত সেই
অতি শোভা করে ॥ তব বস্তু জেবা সাধে সেই তোম্মা জানে । সার দেহ গীরি
দেখি নন্দের নন্দনে ।

The end :—

বিনয় করি যে শুন শ্রীরতি কস্তুরি । মিলয়ে রাধার সঙ্গে নিবেদন কোরি ॥
দোহে কহে তার সঙ্গে কি কাজ তোমার । ছুখি বলে পদতলে কী বলিব আর ॥
ইতি শ্রীসামানন্দ দাস বিরচিতং সাধকসীদ্ধ রূপস্বয়্য দরশণ প্রসঙ্গ সংপূর্ণং ।

(d) Though the book has been catalogued under the name of Sādhaka Siddha, it is divided into four parts. The first part comprises three folia, and is named Govardhana Stavaka. It consists of 23 verses (দুতিয়ে ত্রিবিংশতি স্তব শুনহ আমার) all composed in praise of the hill Govardhana. The second part runs from the folio IV to the folio VI. It is also named Govardhana Stava. It is written in the form of a dialogue between Govardhana and Shyāmānanda. The former thus being praised by Shyāmānanda asked him certain questions respecting his religious faith and following. Shyāmānanda answered that he was the follower of Kaustari Manjari, a Sakhi of Rādhā, and of the teachings of Jiva Goswāmi. The third part is contained in a single folio. Herein Govardhana initiated Shyāmānanda and gave him instruction in spiritual culture. The fourth part runs from the folio VIII to the folio XII. Herein is described how union with God can be effected by following the impulses of a Sakhi of Rādhā.

LXXVII. University manuscript No. 3083. Substance, country-made paper, 12 × 4 inches in size. Folia, five. Lines 14 in a page. Character, Bengali. The script is not dated. The book is written in mixed prose and verse.

(b) The name of the author is Rāmachandra Dāsa.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীশ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণায় নম । ক্ষিতি জল তেজ বাউ আকাশ । এই পঞ্চ রূপে হইল
দেহের সঞ্চার ॥ শোনত সূত্র রজে আধার.....। তাহাকে পঞ্চ ভূত আত্মা কহি ॥
আদেহ বস্তু কি হয় । জিব আত্মা । ইত্যাদি ।

The end :—

শ্রীকৃপ রঘুনাথ পদ হিয়া মাঝে ধরি। এক শত পচিশ তত্ত কহিলাম বিচারি ॥
 শ্রীআচার্য্য প্রভুর পাদপদ্ম করি আশ। সাধ্যর উপায় কহে রামচন্দ্র দাস ॥ ইতি
 জন্মে লিখিতং গ্রন্থ.....হরেং করচাইবং। শুকরি তত্ত মাতা চ, পিতা তত্ত
 গদ্বি। ইতি। লিখিতং শ্রীমোহনদাস বৈরাগী। সাং তেলি পাড়া ॥

(d) The name of the book cannot be ascertained with certainty. It is a composite work consisting of a few short chapters, named as Bhajanaṭikā, Dhāma Prakaraṇa. One hundred and twenty-five Tattvas, etc. Perhaps all these are the means of *সাধ্য*, for, at the end the writer says “সাধ্যর উপায় কহে রামচন্দ্র দাস.” The first part of the book is written in simple prose. Here we have the topics of Ātmā (soul), Indriya (senses), and of the Guṇas (Satva, Raja and Tama), etc. This completes the part named Bhajanaṭikā, towards the middle of a second page. Then we have the chapter on Harināma, and Dhāma Prakaraṇa ending with the third page. The rest of the book deals with the location of various abstract principles in the human body, and also with the incarnation of Caitanya, Nityānanda in the form of later Vaiṣṇava worthies.

LXXVIII. A book dealing with the various aspects of Rati. University manuscript No. 3130. Substance, country-made paper, $12 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size. Folia, 1-6 (incomplete). Lines 12 in a page. Character, Bengali. The book is written in Payāra verses.

(b) The name of the author, and the date of the script cannot be traced as the last page is missing.

(c) The beginning :—

গর্গ মুনি বোলে স্নন পরিক্ষিতের নন্দন। রতির নিশ্চয় পুরাণ প্রমাণ লিখন ॥
 রতি বিনে আর নাই সংসার ভিতর। শিব চিন্তেন বিষ্ণু ব্রহ্ম আর হলধর ॥ etc.

(d) The book deals with Rati, a subject which is so important in the mystic practices of the Sahajiyās. Indeed, it is said that success depends upon *রতিনিষ্ঠা* or the proper performance of Rati. In spiritual culture the union of men and woman of the same nature is strongly advocated, and much depends upon this selection. This book deals with different kinds of men and women, and points out what sort of woman will suit a particular man. The subject of births of sons and daughters, the causes leading to the happiness and

sorrow, and what makes one good and the other vicious are some of the subjects elaborately dealt with in the treatise. The evil that may follow from the union of men and women of different and opposite types is also pointed out. This book deals with these and other allied Sahajiyā subjects.

LXXIX. Rasa Kadamva. University manuscript No. 3174. Substance, country-made paper, 15×5 inches in size. Folia, 1-54. Lines 7 in a page. Character, Bengali. The book is mostly written in Payāra. The script is dated 1182 B.S., corresponding to 1775 A.D.

(b) The name of the author is Kavi Vallabha.

(c) The beginning :—

শ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ গতিমম। রসকদম্ব পুস্তক লিখিতে। শ্রীকৃষ্ণচরণাযুজং রসভক্ত-
মধুরতং। নবরসকদম্বাক্ষং করোতি কবিবল্লবং॥ প্রথম পয়ার ছন্দ। আভির
রাগ। ইত্যাদি।

The end :—

বিংশতি অধিক পঞ্চদশ সত সূক। তখন রচিল রসকদম্ব পুস্তক ॥.....পুস্তক
সুন্দর। দুইশতাধিক ছয় অর্কুত অক্ষর ॥ কৃষ্ণকথা শুন.....হঞা এক মন।
শ্রীকবিবল্লভ কহে সার এহি ধন ॥.....কথা দিষ্ট তথালিখিতং লিখকো দোস নাস্তিক।
ভিন্নতাপি, etc., ইতি সাক্ষর শ্রীযুগলদাস। পাঠ.....etc.

(d) The author begins with a discourse on Bhakti and Prema, and then pays his reverence to Caitanya Deva and his companions and disciples such as Advaita, Nityānanda, Gadādhara and Uddhava Dāsa. Then he says that he is going to write Rasakadamva in Payāra of fourteen words in a line. Then the author begins with the subjects of Kṛṣṇa's life. His birth in the womb of Daivaki, his early life in the house of Jashodā, the death of Putanā, tending of cows, the destruction of Vaka, Agha, Pralamva and other demons, the raising of the hill Govardhana, amours with the Gopis, and other incidents of the life of Kṛṣṇa are here noted down. It is also stated that after the death of Kāṁsa, his two wives went to their father Jarāsaṁdha who formed an alliance with the other kings and attacked Kṛṣṇa. He was defeated seventeen times, but when he attacked again, Kṛṣṇa left Mathurā, and

went to Dvārakā and established his capital there. Here the description of the citizens is very charming :—

স্বরগণ নিরবধি তাতে করে স্থিতি ।
 প্রণত কন্দরে থাকে অহর্নিশিপতি ॥
 প্রতি জীব জিহ্বাতে বসতি সরস্বতী ।
 প্রতি ঘরে মাতৃরূপ লক্ষ্মী সরস্বতী ॥
 সর্বদেহে কাম বসে মুর্তিমান হৈয়া ।
 প্রতি অঙ্গে ক্ষেমা শাস্তি ধর্ম নীতি দয়া ॥

etc., etc. Page 5.

“The Devas are the constant dwellers of that city, and the Sun and the Moon dispel its darkness offering their humble services to the Lord. In every tongue dwells the Goddess of poesy, and each house has for its presiding deities the Goddesses of Fortune and Learning. Kāma or sweet desire is personated in every figure, and every limb displays the nimble play of peace and piety, of forgiveness and other ethical qualities.”

It should be noted that in the description of the people of Dvārakā, the author simply speaks about their moral excellence, without dwelling much on their material prosperity.

About the women of Dvārakā, the poet says :—

নগরে নাগরিগণ সমবেসি সর্বজন
 যৌবন নাছারে কার অঙ্গ ।
 কুটিল সুরূক্ষ কেশ ভুবনমোহন বেশ
 অঙ্গে অঙ্গে রসের তরঙ্গ ॥
 শলী জিনি পদনখ উপরে যবক রেখ
 অঙ্গুলি স্ততঃ দির্ঘ শোভে ।
 রামরস্তা উরুগুরু বিপুল নিতম্ব চারু
 জঘন সঘন মনলোভে ॥
 সুকটীন তমু ক্ষীণ জিবলি বলিত জেন
 খিন নিবি বসন বিলাসে ॥
 মৃদল কণ্টকহীন মৃণাল সুবাহুচিহ্ন
 চম্পক কলিকা তাহে শোভে ।
 চলিতে অঙ্গুলিদাম ধরে নানা বর্ণশ্যাম
 উজ্জল কনকবর্ণ দেহে ॥

সচল কনকলতা অচল তরিং ছটা
 কিবা পীত ননীৰ গুতলি ।
 প্রবাল রক্ত মনি কভু নাহি দেখি শুনি
 অমল শরীরে ঝলমলি ॥

Page 8.

“The town-girls are all dressed in the same manner, and possess permanent youthfulness. They have hair of deep black colour which looks very charming. A graceful wave of loveliness runs over the whole frame. The nails of the feet are more beautiful than the moon; they have paints of red colour, and are beautifully long. Arms are like soft stalks of lotus without thorn, and the fingers are like Champaka buds. The colour of the body is bright as gold. It is gracefully restless like a moving golden creeper, yet in brightness it resembles, as it were, a streak of lightning fixed at a spot. White gems of reddish tint are never seen, but they can be viewed in the colour of the women.”

In that city of Dvārakā, there are nine lacs of houses, of which sixteen thousand and eight are very splendid. Eight of them are specially built, one of which, again, is the finest of all. In this palace lives Rukmini, one of the chief queens of Kṛṣṇa. One day Kṛṣṇa was sitting there on a beautiful throne served by the beautiful chamber-maids, when Rukmini made her appearance. She sent away the maids, and took up the service on herself. Thereupon Kṛṣṇa by way of joke asked her why of all the kings she selected him for her husband. Her father Bhisṃaka had assembled all the kings of India and her friends and relatives advised her to select Śiśupāla, one of the great kings. But “how could you, Rukmini, select me who am without a kingdom, and who live in an island for fear of them? Moreover, you have numberless maids beautiful as nymphs, it behoves you that you should sit with me on the throne and that these maids should serve us. But instead of doing that, I find you are very keen to serve me yourself! This surprises me all the more.” Rukmini was taken aback, and with tears in her eyes, she said—“Darling, what you say is worthy of you, for your observations show a nice discernment. What you say is beyond the conception of the Vedas with its thousand branches, how can an ignorant woman like myself

answer you? It is true you are not a king, but why should you be entangled in the riches of the world? It is also true that you are not desired by the rich, but the poor craves for you with hearts full of love. You have created Brahmā, and are worshipped by the Sun. You are loved by all, and provide for the welfare of all the beings. How can I know you? In fact I serve you, because you have given me the privilege to do so." Kṛṣṇa became abashed and offered explanations—"Be not sorry, my darling! You do not know that we men are generally very unhappy. We learn in childhood, and earn in youth with the aim of getting a wife and becoming a householder, but the wife is ever over-reserved in everything. She rarely surrenders herself in the loving embrace of the husband, keeps herself aloof, and the shyness of a young wife is torturous to the zealous husband. And when a child is born, the wife rules supreme, and cares more for the child than the husband." Rukminī retorted—"You are mistaken, dear Lord, we women are all for you. The husband is more dear to us than anything else. We often pray for him, ask for boon from every God we worship, and work for the happiness of husband alone. We are reserved, shy, and a little unforward, because the outside world does not count so much with us. We dare not look at the face of the husband, but long to enjoy the sight of that face reflected on the mirror of our mind. It is pure love that we offer at his service." Kṛṣṇa begged her pardon for thus offending her, and admitted that pure love only is the special characteristic of the women. But very few of the human beings know of this love. This pure love is only known to those who follow the mode of worship by means of Anurāga only. (Page 17.) The excellence of the Sahajiyā mode of worship is thus admitted by Kṛṣṇa.

It runs thus :—

অনুরাগ অনুজাই জাহার ভজন ।
 নিশ্চল আসক্ত ভাব বুঝে সেই জন ॥
 রম্যবত নামে গিরি উত্তরে প্রধান ।
 ভুবন মোহন সেই অদ্ভুত নিশ্চয় ॥
 রসিক অমরগণ তাতে করে স্থিতি ।
 তাহাতে প্রচার মাত্র নিশ্চল আসক্তি ॥

সে সব কোতুক কথা কি কহিতে পারি ।

সাধারণ জন নহে তার অধিকারি ॥

কৃষ্ণ মুখ-বচনে কুঙ্কিণী হরসিতা ।

উপরোধ জন্মায় কহিল সুচরিতা ॥

শুন ২ প্রাণনাথ রসিক সেখর ।

কি মতে দেখিব হেন গিরি মনোহর ॥

শরীরের কার্য এহি নিত্য দেখি শুনি ।

স্বামীর প্রসাদে মাত্র শুদ্ধ প্রেম জানি ॥

অশেষ কোতুক রস আছে ক্ষিতি মাঝে ।

পুরুষের মধ্যে মাত্র কেহ ২ বুঝে ॥

Page 17.

“He alone understands what the pure love is—who offers his services at the dictates of his attachment only. In the north there is a hill called Raivataka. It is wonderfully built, and is the attraction of the whole world. The gods who are full of love live there. It is there that pure love manifests itself. I fail to speak of those charming tales, but it can be said that ordinary men are not competent to follow this love.” Rukminī became glad at the words of Kṛṣṇa, and she, of unspotted character, said with earnest request,—“Dear husband, how can I see that charming hill? Here in this world we often meet with what is simply a physical craving, but the husband, if he so desires, can show us what is true love indeed. There are many attractive things in this world, but only the limited few among men know them.”

It should be observed that the teaching here is wholly Sahajiyā. The Sahajiyās discard the physical elements in love, and take up natural affection of utmost purity as the only means of realising God. But what is this love likened to? They say it is typified in the love of a young woman for a beautiful and young man. At least the love of a woman for her lover can symbolise that to some extent. And hence the Sahajiyās say that unless a man can become woman (*i.e.*, possess the tenderness of a love-lorn woman), he cannot experience what pure love is. The same thing is narrated here. Rukminī on behalf of women speaks about her own love for her husband, and Kṛṣṇa admits her plea, and acknowledges her devotion, regretting that such love as her's is not generally met with among men. This reminds us of what Cañḍīdāsa says—“Every one speaks of Sahajiyā love, but it is not so very easy to adopt

that. Among thousands one can know that love.”¹ To satisfy the curiosity of Rukmini, Kṛṣṇa orders for his chariot, and then the husband and the wife proceed towards Raivataka. On the way, while crossing the ocean, Rukmini asks Kṛṣṇa as to how many oceans, earths, hills, and people are there in this universe. In answer to this query Kṛṣṇa speaks about creation, the seven Pātālas (lower regions), and about the situation of earth over the serpent king Vāsuki. In this earth there is a mountain called Sumeru which is surrounded by three smaller hills, i.e., by Mandāra in the north and east, by Kumuda in the south, and by Supārśva in the west (pp. 20-21). The Mandāra hill has four other hills surrounding it. In this hill there is a mango-tree, as well as a Jambu-tree from which the name Jambu-dvīpa (India) is derived.

Then about creation. Brahmā created many sons, but none of them thought about procreating children. Then he created a son named Svayambhuva Manu, and a daughter named Satarūpā, from whose union originated the various creatures of the world. Manu had two sons, of whom Priyavrata was the eldest, and Uttānapāda the youngest. Priyavrata ruled over Martyaloka (earth), and was a very powerful king. He found the sun circling round the Sumeru and causing day and night. Thereupon, he created a chariot and began to circle round the Sumeru keeping himself always opposite to the sun. The high speed caused impression on the earth and it was difficult for the chariot to go on. The king threw off the wheels which falling on the earth created seven deep hollows. These hollows were afterwards filled up with honey, milk and water, etc., and were called oceans. These oceans created seven islands, one of which was called Jambudvīpa. Now, after the demise of Priyavrata his seven sons ruled over the seven islands, his eldest son Agnidhara ruling over the Jambudvīpa (India). Then follow descriptions of Brahmāloka, Viṣṇuloka, Śivaloka and Vaikuṇṭha, a discussion about the reasons of sorrow and happiness, of Satva, Raja and Tama; of Prakṛiti, the cause of bondage, of the works of the sinners (up to p. 33).

¹ সহজ সহজ সবায় কহয়

সহজ সহজ নয়। etc.

And কেটীতে শুটীক হয়।

Then Rukminī uttered praises of Kṛṣṇa, in course of which she said :—

সম্পীতি তোমার নাম রূপ গুণ অমুপাম
সদা সরস প্রেমযোগে ।
সব ভাব সব রস অথচ স্বভাব রস
সর্ব্ব ভঞ্জে গাঢ় অমুরাগে ॥

“You are incomparable in beauty and good qualities ; people are always devoted to your name with pure love. There are other emotions, yet they worship you with natural love.”

The phrase স্বভাব রস is purely Sahajiyā, and as the author praises it above all others, it is undoubtedly true that he hinted at the Sahajiyā culture at this place.

Again :—

সকল তপস্বি মেলি যপ তপ যোগ ছাড়ি
প্রেমরস সঘনে ধিয়ায় ॥
আপন সহজ যশ কহিতে নিগুড় রস
যদি মোকে দাসী বুদ্ধি কর ।
কে তুমি কোথাতে স্থিতি কোনভাবে সুখমতী
কপট ভঙ্গিয়া হির কর ॥

Pages. 33-34.

“All the sages think of you with love after giving up Yapa, Tapa and Yoga (*i.e.*, austere practices). Taking me as your follower, kindly speak to me about your Sahajiyā manifestations, and also tell me who you are, where you dwell, and what gives you joy, in plain language as clearly as possible.”

The idea of giving up austerities, and adopting the mode of love, is the pet theory of the Sahajiyās. Besides, the mention of সহজ যশ of Kṛṣṇa, is very significant. This shows that the author is gradually drifting towards the Sahajiyā culture.

Moreover :—

কুমারিকা কালে হনে ভাব কৈল প্রাণপণে
বিপ্র দিয়া পত্র পাঠাইল ।
কুলজা স্বভাব ধরি অতি হেন মতি করি
আজ্ঞা বিম্ব রথত চড়িল ॥

যুদ্ধে মৈল বিরগণ সহোদর বিরহন
 তাতে মোর না জন্মিল খেদ ।
 * * *
 অহুরাগে সকলি হরিলে ॥
 ইন্দ্রিয় প্রধান মন হরিলে সে সব ধন
 জাজ্ঞাবিনে কি করিতে পারি ।
 কুলজা কুলটা রিতি না বুঝিয়া কোন গতি
 তোমার ইচ্ছায়ে ক'ৰ্ম করি ॥

Page 34.

“I loved you with all my heart even when I was an unmarried girl, and sent you a letter of invitation through the priest. Though born in a high family, I got up on your chariot without your permission, thus bringing disgrace upon our family. In the fighting, many heroes of my father's side died, and my brother was humbled, but I was not sorry on that account. My love for you made me forget everything; you have also attracted my mind with all the senses. I can do nothing without your permission. I do not know what behoves a good woman and a bad one, the distinction I have quite forgotten, and I only work as you desire me.”

This is the real characteristic of Sahajiyā love. One should forget himself, his joys and sorrows, and be ready to suffer for the lover, if one wishes to follow the Sahajiyā love; and be in every way dependent on the lover who should be the sole support. The author here ascribes all these characteristics to Rukminī. Though born in a family of high culture she did not hesitate to behave like a coquette for the sake of Kṛṣṇa. In this way the author places her on the same footing with Rādhā, indeed, he has made Rukminī very much like Rādhā. “কুলজা কুলটা রিতি না বুঝিয়া কোন গতি” is nothing but an echo of “সতী বা অসতী তোমাতে বিদিত, ভাল মন্দ নাহি জানি” (I do not know what is good or bad). Here Caṇḍīdāsa and Kavivallava repeat the same melodious music, the common theme of an all-sacrificing love of the Sahajiyās. Then Rukminī asks—“When you are the creator of all, how is it that you bring sorrow unto men?” In answer Kṛṣṇa narrated the various stages of the birth of man. The situation of the psycho-physiological nerves in the human body is here pointed out. Here the author has used terms like Satchakra, Kamala (lotus), Kuṇḍalīnī, Iḍā, Pingalā,

and Susumnā. It is also said that there are 72,000 nerves in human body, of which ten are superior (p. 36). Here the author is undoubtedly indebted to Tantrikism, but it should be noted that the Sahajiyās, who are also advocates of mystic practices, believe, in this ultra-nerve-system of metaphysical Tantrikism ; indeed, they have written a number of books on this subject, some of which like *Amṛtaratnāvalī*, *Dehakaṇṭhācā*, etc., we have already discussed before. True Vaiṣṇavism has nothing to do with these subtle things, for the Vaiṣṇavas proceed through love, and they are not the advocates of mystic practices for spiritual advancement. *Rasa-kadamva* in this respect seems to be an exponent of the Sahajiyā cult.

Then it is said that this body of ours is like a kingdom, ruled over by the powerful Mana. He has two sons, of whom *Ahaṁkāra* (pride) is the elder. *Ahaṁkāra* has *Kāma*, *Krodha*, *Lobha*, *Moha* and *Mada* as his companions. The younger named *Vinaya* is physically weak, but he has *Dayā* (kindness), *Kṣemā* (pardon), *Dharma* (religion), etc., as his companions. These two brothers are constantly fighting with each other for the possession of the kingdom of their father. The father is old, and so he obeys the command of the sons. When *Ahaṁkāra* becomes powerful, he performs evil deeds with the help of his companions *Kāma*, *Lova*, etc. This brings sufferings on man. But when *Vinaya* is powerful, he performs good deeds, which result in happiness. This is the secret of joy and sorrow of man (p. 39).

Rukmini then desired to know about the most subtle doctrine (পরমতত্ত্ব). *Kṛṣṇa* said—

গোবিন্দ বলেন প্রিয়া তোমার প্রসাদে ।

কহিব পরমতত্ত্ব প্রেম উপরোধে ॥

গুহ্যাদি অধিক গুহ্য প্রেম লিলা কথা ।

তুমি হেন প্রেম পাত্রে কহিব সর্বথা ॥

P. 39.

Govinda said—“ Darling, for the sake of love I bear you I must tell you that the subtle doctrine of love is very mystic, but I must tell of it to you, who are so very dear to me.”

Then :—

বৈকুণ্ঠ আদি যতেক স্থানের প্রধান ।

আবির্ভাব তিরোভাব সভাতে প্রধান ॥

কিন্তু নিত্যস্থান আছে মনের অগম্য ।
 সাধারণে কি কার্য্য আমাতে বড় রম্য ॥
 হ্রাস মৃত্যু নাহি তাতে জরা মৃত্যু ভয় ।
 সাধন ক্রিড়ার হেতু নিত্য রূপে রম্য ॥
 এ সব নিগুড় কথা শুন কর্ম ভেদ ।
 সর্বকাল সেবা করি না বুঝিল বেদ ॥

P. 40.

“All regions like Baikunṭha and others, are not free from birth and death, but there is an everlasting abode, which is beyond conception, the very thought of which rouses a sense of pleasure and curiosity in me, not to speak of other persons. That blessed region is free from birth and death, growth and decay, infirmity and fear. This abode is on a mystic plane, which even the Vedas could not know inspite of their comprehensive character and sanctity.”

This introduces a religion which is outside the sphere of the Vedas and the science is Guhya (mystic). The description of Satya-loka which is the goal of the Sahajiyās is similar to this description of Nitya Sthāna. (*Vide* Amṛtarasāvalī, noticed in the section III.)

Then follows a description of Nitya Sthāna. Here Kṛṣṇa sports with Rādhikā who is ever youthful. They are served by many female companions, named, Vrindā, Ranga Devi, Subhadrā, Bhadrā, Ratnarekhā and others who “serve Kṛṣṇa in the form of women.”

রমণী স্বরূপে তারা কৃষ্ণ সেবা করে ।

Also—শক্তিতে আশক্তি করে সখীভাব করি । P. 48.

And—মানুষে প্রকৃতি হয় রময়ে আপনা ।

কাল যোগে হয় তারা দিব্য বরাদ্দনা ॥ P. 48.

“Adopting the emotions of a female companion they zealously desire the company of women.

Thus men transform themselves to women (in spirit) for enjoying their true selves (the true self is God). Hence these men, having fully imbibed the spirit of women, turn themselves into Divyāṅganā (celestial women-goddesses) in the long run.”

Then Kṛṣṇa says:—

সে সব নাগরি এহি ব্রজ বধুগণ ॥
 তা সভা সম্ভাষা আমি করি ধ্যান যোগে । •
 মন প্রাণ তুল্য করি গাপি প্রেমভাগে ॥

“ These devotees of mine, who have adopted the feminine emotions for enjoying my love have been born as the milk-women of Vraja. I hold my intercourse with them when I am absorbed in spiritual felicities. The love of the Gopis I hold dear to my life and soul.” This is truly Sahajiyā in spirit and culture.

Then Rukminī asked Kṛṣṇa about the love of the Gopis. “ They were all full of Parakiyā love. The Vedas speak only of the union of men and women as husbands and wives without laying much stress on love that unite them. But these Gopis are country-women and so very simple in nature. They work in the household always yearning for union with me in the forest. And when we meet, how happy is the union ! The wild grove is the scene of our sports, the place is dim under the shades of the trees, the wind blows with the scent of the flowers, and the bees become, as it were, mad after honey. The cuckoo sing in thrilling notes. Such beauty and enjoyment cannot be described in words. This is enjoying the divine nectar, without which all other things appear stale and uninteresting.” Kṛṣṇa then says that there are two ways of realising God, both of which are enunciated by the Vedas. The Nivṛtti mode of worship is adopted by the ascetics. They renounce home, look to the friends and enemies with equal sympathy, make no difference between the dunghill and sandal, they are indifferent to heat and cold, and in the living body they live like the dead. But the Pravartas travel in the opposite direction. They think of birth as something very true. They receive instructions from the Guru, worship Kṛṣṇa in diverse ways ; though they maintain family they always long for the works that would satisfy God. These men attain to the nature of women in emotion. They spiritualise whatever they find in this world, and form ideals which they worship with all devotion (pp. 54-55).

Then Kṛṣṇa turns to the topics of Bhakti. It is cultured in ninefold ways. When Āśakti (intense love) arises in mind, the devotee assumes the following characteristics :—

অতি সঙ্কোপনে করে নিবিড় পীরিতি ।

প্রাণপণে করে তারা সর্বত্র গোপন ।

কলঙ্ক মুনিয়া করে চিন্তা অমুক্ষণ ॥

* * *

লাজ ভয় না মানে উন্মত্ত হয় থাকে ।

মরণ-কলঙ্ক লজ্জা কিছু নাহি দেখে ॥

কেবল নিষ্কল হয় সভাকে গোচরে ।

আপনার প্রিয় তারা পায় যত দূরে ॥ P. 57.

“ They observe the utmost secrecy in regard to their love, though the people speak ill of them. They think of love every moment. Even if the people spread scandal, they do not give up, but become the more devoted to their love. They become as if mad after love, and do not care for shame or fear. They are not even afraid of death. They enquire with utmost zeal until they get their object of love.”

Herein we find the image of Rādhā mad after Kṛṣṇa, always enquiring of her companions until she meets her lover. Then the author returns to the characteristics of Anurāga. It is of two kinds, which may be called, bearing reference to women, Rasikā and Kāmukā. The Kāmukās are given up to the enjoyment of the pleasure of the senses, and they do everything for their own enjoyment. Among the devotees there is a class of persons who are of this nature. They worship God for the purpose of their own benefit. They are like those who drink poison even when they have a taste for nectar :—

কৃষ্ণের ভজন করে নিজ কার্য লাগি ।

অমৃত পাইলে জেন বিষে উপভোগি ॥ P. 58.

But there are men of another class who are like chaste women. They do everything for the enjoyment of the husband, and try to satisfy the Lord in all possible ways. This class is the best of the two.

There are also certain passages in this book which deserve attention. We find the word কৰ্ত্তা (creator) sometimes substituted for God as in

কৰ্ত্তার অধীন হইয়া যদি করে ।

তবে অনায়াসে কৃষ্ণ ভজিবারে পারে ॥ P. 59.

"success becomes easy when the work is done, as if under the guidance of a commanding spirit." Perhaps the influence of the Kartābhajās has left these traces in the book. .

Then a few words about idol worship. Rukmiṇī asked—"How is it that men make images of gods on stones, and worship them, but not the Supreme Being?" Kṛṣṇa answered—"This is called Āropa Sādhana. Herein men ascribe the attributes of God to these figures, and worship them with reverence. This is not altogether bad, but the best is the worship of the Highest discarding all substitutes (p. 62).

Then begins a long discussion about the worldly life of men. They work for the maintenance of family, but the relatives look to their own happiness, and speak ill of the householder on some pretext or other. In this way they labour on till death. (Up to p. 67.)

The Vedas are created with the attributes of males, as it were. They are full of masculine energy and altogether ignore the tender emotions of the heart. They deal with what a man should do, and what he should shun. They desire to know about the নিত্য লীলা (secrets of the all-enduring creative evolution), but fail, for it is not possible for any male being to attain to that secret. As only the females have free access to that secret treasure, the Smṛtis (supplementary Vedic literature) created themselves into girls, and became the companions of Kṛṣṇa to learn that doctrine. Afterwards, they were called back, and asked to tell what they saw. Though they knew it, they did not speak about this secret doctrine. It is thus said that Kṛṣṇa cannot be known through the Vedas. Then came the Bhaktas like Nārada and others. They laboured through emotions for a long time, and became successful, but as soon as they regained the male form, they could not give up their natural characteristics. Hence though they spoke about the love of Kṛṣṇa, they only dealt with the higher spiritual love, and their teachings formed the subject of the books like the Rātra class, such as Rāma-Brahmā-Barāha-Nārada-Rātras. As the subject of Rasa was not explicitly dealt with in these books, the Vaiṣṇavas, on the basis of Srutis, wrote a number of books called Saṃhitās, which are mere collections. But the real Bhāva (emotions) cannot be found in these books. Moreover, these books are equivocal, for sometimes they support

one principle, while elsewhere they discard it. Thus far about the Vedic literature. Now, hear about the নিত্য লীলা

Up to p. 68.

নিত্য বৃন্দাবনে কৃষ্ণ গোপিনী সঙ্গতি ।
প্রকৃতিতে গুপ্ত হৈয়া ভোগ করে রতি ॥
গোপকত্বা নহে তারা প্রকৃতি প্রধান ।
কৃষ্ণকে গোপিয়া ধরে গোপী হেন নাম ॥

* * * *

কায়মন বাক্যে তারা ক্রীড়ারস ভোগে ।
তে কারণে কৃষ্ণ তারা গুরুবর্ণ দেখে ॥

* * * *

হৃদয় কমল তার কৃষ্ণবর্ণ ধরে ।

ভাবযোগে কৃষ্ণ রাখে আপন অন্তরে ॥ p. 69.

"In the divine Vṛndāvana there is Kṛṣṇa in the company of the Gopis. He tastes the enjoyment of attachment by hiding himself among the Gopis. These Gopis should not be taken as the girls of the Gopas (milk-men), but they are called Gopis, because they hold fast about Kṛṣṇa. They serve Kṛṣṇa in mind, body, and speech, i.e., all absorbed; so Kṛṣṇa appears to them in pure white hue. They have the heart deep blue in intense love, for they hold Kṛṣṇa in the inner soul by bonds of emotions."

This is the highest ideal of the devotees who seek emancipation through the medium of love only. The author here is ever careful to eliminate the physical element in spiritual culture.

Then about the devotees :—

স্ব-সাধকে প্রথমে সঞ্চয় করে ধন ।
ধন হৈতে ধর্ম সাধে এহি প্রয়োজন ॥
ধর্ম হৈতে জ্ঞান জন্মে, জ্ঞানে জন্মে ভক্তি ।
ভক্তি হৈতে প্রেম জন্মে প্রেমেতে আসক্তি ॥
কৃষ্ণের আসক্তি রস পরম বিরল ।
লইতে না পারে যেন কেবল চঞ্চল ॥

* * * *

দেখিতে না দেখে কেহ ভজিতে না ভজে ॥
রতি নাম শুনি তারা উপহাসে দহে ।
পুরুষের প্রকৃতি ভাব এহো সত্য নহে ॥ P. 70.

“A good devotee, first of all, acquires the wealth of vigour. From this spiritual power they earn Dharma, from Dharma arises Jñāna (spiritual insight), from Jñāna comes Bhakti (love), from which again follow Prema and Āśakti (intense love). This intense love of Kṛṣṇa is very sacred, and is too subtle to be comprehended. It is so mystic in nature that even the learned cannot truly define its nature. The common people laugh in contempt when they hear of Rati, and say that it is ridiculous and foolish to suppose that a man can adopt the ways of a woman.”

The above gives in an epigrammatic form the very essence of spiritual mysticism of the Sahajiyās. Then Kṛṣṇa and Rukminī went to eq Raivataka hill. There they were heartily received by the inhabitants who also treated them with due reverence. During their stay at that place Nārada came to see Kṛṣṇa. He was received with due kindness and was asked about the reason of his visit there. He said that he was coming from Amarāvati, the heaven of Indra. Indra had given him a Pārijāta flower, which Nārada accepted and thinking that Kṛṣṇa was the only person fit to receive the heavenly present, Nārada came to Raivataka to offer that flower to Kṛṣṇa. So saying he put the flower in the hands of Kṛṣṇa, who again gave it to Rukminī his devoted wife. The author has given in the mouth of Nārada an elaborate description of hell, pointing out the punishments appropriate for each kind of sin.

Up to page 77.

Then Nārada went away. On his way he came across Dvārakā, and was desirous of knowing how the people there lived during the absence of Kṛṣṇa who was dear to them as their life. He went to the palace of Satyabhāmā and was greeted with due reverence and courtesy. Nārada thought within himself—“Among the wives of Kṛṣṇa Rukminī and Satyabhāmā occupy the highest position. Both of them love Kṛṣṇa with equal ardour, yet how is it that when Kṛṣṇa is away with Rukminī, Satyabhāmā is as happy as before? I shall see to it.” Having resolved thus he narrated how Indra gave him a Pārijāta flower, and how he gave it to Kṛṣṇa who in turn gave it to Rukminī. Then Nārada dwelt on the love of Rukminī and Kṛṣṇa and praised their mutual affection for each other. Satyabhāmā was caught in the trap, she swooned in utter sorrow and

rage, and manifested many symptoms of the pangs of jealousy. Nārada became frightened, he went straight to Kṛṣṇa and informed him about what had happened. Kṛṣṇa returned to Dvārakā without delay and went to the palace of Satyabhāmā. She was pleased once more when Kṛṣṇa made a promise to her of giving her hundred such flowers. Then Kṛṣṇa went with Satyabhāmā and Nārada to the abode of Indra. Nārada was deputed to demand the flower from Indra, but he refused, and made preparation for armed resistance. In the fight that ensued, the Devas were defeated, and the tree of Pārijāta was uprooted by Kṛṣṇa and planted at the gate of the palace of Satyabhāmā in Dvārakā. The author has described with considerable power the conflicting emotions in Kṛṣṇa and his consorts. The jealousy of Satyabhāmā and Kṛṣṇa's solicitude to please her have been delineated with much skill, and Indra is sketched as a powerful rival of the pastoral god.

Kṛṣṇa brought Rukminī and Satyabhāmā together. He made each of his consorts sit on each of his knees, and spoke to Satyabhāmā about the secrets of নিত্যলোক—the everlasting heaven of bliss. Then what follows is a true picture of the Sahajiyā cult:—

দোহাকে কিসোর রসে মত্ত শিখাইলা ॥
আপনে হইলা গুরু শিষ্য দুই নারী ।
দীক্ষা করাইলা মহা মত্ত অধিকারী ॥

* * * *

এহি চতুর্দশাক্ষরে মত্তচূড়ামনি ।
পঞ্চমেত চারিবিজে কলাবিন্দুজানি ॥
কৃষ্ণস্থানে জানিল রুক্মিণী সত্যভামা ।
কিশোরের ভাবে তার হৈলা অতি প্রেমা ॥
কৃষ্ণ অঙ্গে করে তারা কিশোরের ভাব ।
প্রতিদিন বাড়ল নবীন প্রেম লাভ ॥

Page 85.

“Then Kṛṣṇa taught both of them the mystic formula steeped in the emotions of the first youth. He himself became the Guru (spiritual guide) and the two wives were his disciples. By initiating them he made them true disciples of the mystic doctrine. These (narrated in the lacuna) fourteen words constitute the most holy mantra. Finally, there are four other mystic formula which aim at the realisation of কলাবিন্দু (mystic terms to signify a certain place in the

head, close to the junction of the two eyes, which is the abode of *Paramātmā*, in the plane of super-sensual perception). Thus being taught by Kṛṣṇa, those two ladies became attached to Kṛṣṇa in whom they discovered the never-dying and ever-youthful charms of a *Kiśora*, and gradually they increased in love as they went on culturing this emotion."

Here the author makes a summary of his teachings :—

পত্নীপ্রতি যত স্নেহ করে কামিগণ ।
সেহি প্রেম করিলে সে লভে প্রেমধন ॥
পুত্রপ্রতি যত স্নেহ করয়ে জননী ।
সেই স্নেহ কৃষ্ণে হইলে ভজন বাখানি ॥' etc.

Page 86.

"All the love which a young man feels for his new bride, all the affection which a doting mother feels for her child,—in a word, all the secular passions of a person should be spiritualised and bestowed on Godhead, and then alone will the higher mystic love be achieved."

Then the author says that this doctrine was first learnt by *Dvārūka* who at the time of his death taught it to the sage *Garga*. He taught it to *Suta* and others. In time it was known to the people of *Vidarbha*. Then from *Kṛṣṇa Saṁhitā* all became acquainted with it. Then in the *Kali* age God incarnated himself in *Caitanya*. He manifested to the world the wealth of this secret love. In *Vrindāvana Rūpa* and *Sanātana* described this mystic doctrine to *Banamāli*. This marks the beginning of this mode of spiritual culture.

According to this author, the present form of *Sahajiyā* doctrine originated in *Vrindāvana* after the passing away of *Caitanya*.

Page 86.

Now, about the author. He, thus, speaks about himself in the two manuscripts we have in our possession :—

নিজস্বরূপ ঠাকুর উদ্ধব দাস নাম ।
তার প্রসাদে হৈল সংসারের ত্রাণ ॥
* * * * *
কুপার ঠাকুর নরহরিদাস নামে ।
সে পদে মুকুট রায় ভজিল যতনে ॥

দ্বিজকুলে জন্মিয়া সেহি মহাশয় ।
 অল্পরোধে জন্ম হইল প্রবন্ধ নির্ণয় ॥
 তাহার উদ্বোধনে কিছু লিখিল কারণ ।
 যন্ত্রযোগে শব্দ যেন বলে যন্ত্রিগণ ॥
 পিতা রাজবল্লভ বৈষ্ণবী হেন মাতা ।
 জন্মিয়া গোঁচর কৈল সংসারের ব্যথা ॥
 আর যত বঙ্গগণ দিল উপদেশ ।
 তা সভাকে কৃষ্ণ প্রেম লভুক বিশেষ ॥
 করতোয়া নিকটে মহাস্থানের সমীপে ।
 আবরা গ্রামেতে বাস আছিল স্বরূপে ॥

Page 87.

The second manuscript has the following :—

— — উদ্ধব দাস নাম ।
 তাহার প্রসাদে হৈল সংশারে ভাল ॥
 * * * *
 কুপার ঠাকুর নরহরিদাস নামে ।
 সে পদে মকুটরায় ভজিল জতনে ॥
 দ্বিজ কুলে জন্ম সেহি বঙ্গ মহাশয় ।
 অল্পরোধে জন্ম হৈল প্রবন্ধ নির্ণয় ॥
 তাহার উদ্বোধনে কিছু লিখিল কারণ ।
 যন্ত্র জোগে শব্দ জেন বোলে যন্ত্রিগণ ॥
 পিতা রাজবল্লভ বৈষ্ণবী হেন মাতা ।
 জন্মাঞা গোঁচর কৈল সংসারের বেথা ॥
 আর জত বঙ্গগণ কৈল উপদেশ ।
 তা সভাকে কৃষ্ণপ্রেম লভুক বিশেষ ॥
 করতয়া তীর মহাস্থানের সমীপে ।
 আবড়া গ্রামেতে বাস আছিল ... ॥

Page 54.

From both these texts, as well as from the text of the manuscript published in the Sāhitya Parisad Patrikā of 1308 B.S., pp. 38-49, the name of the father of the poet is Rājavallabha. and of the mother is Vaignavi. Now, about his native home. আবরা is found in both these manuscripts, the Sāhitya Parisad Patrikā has অরোড়া. The name of the village is therefore somewhat like আবরা or অরোড়া, but the difference is not very great. The name of the river is করতোয়া. It seems that the poet simply refers to his former home, as indicated by the use of the word আছিল. Moreover the mention of

মহাস্থান as a place of some distinction near about his native village justifies the use of the word আছিল. This মহাস্থান is in the district of Bagurā (*vide* Bānglār Itihāsa by Babu Rakhal Das Banerjee, Part I, pp. 299-300), and the river Karatoyā is in that district. In the Sāhitya Parisad Patrikā, we find the reading is

করতোয়া তির মহাস্থানের সমীপে ।
অরোঢ়া গ্রামেতে জন্ম বসতি স্বরূপে ॥

Most probably the poet at first points out that his birthplace was at অরোঢ়া near Mahāsthāna on the bank of the Karatoyā, and then he speaks about his present home stating that at the time of writing this book he was the inhabitant of a place, which, from his connection with Mukuṭa Rāi, might be the capital of that king. But everything depends upon the identification of মুকুটরায়. The manner in which this name has been mentioned in the manuscripts creates the impression that he was a well-known person of the locality. Now, who was this Mukuṭa Rāi. In the History of Jessore and Khulnā written by Professor Satishchandra Mitra, we come across four persons bearing this name. It is difficult to ascertain who this Mukuṭa Rāi was, who was a friend and patron of the poet. But it can be definitely said that he was living in 1520 Saka corresponding to 1599 A.D., which is the date expressly mentioned by the poet as the date of the composition of the poem. Now, at this time Bengal was passing through a crisis. The province was practically under the sway of Mān Sinha, the General of Akbar. At about this time Mān Sinha on urgent call had to go to the Deccan to help the Emperor in his campaign in the South. The Afghan chiefs who were in Orissa took this opportunity to invade Bengal and captured Sātgaon (Saptagram). Mān Sinha, thereupon, returned to Bengal and quelled the rebellion. (Stewart's History of Bengal, pp. 188-189.)

The poet further says that Thākur Nara Hari Dās was the Guru of Mukuṭa Rāi. Now, in Dr. Dineschandra Sen's Chaitanya and His Companions it is noted that Nara Hari Sarkar died in 1541 A.D. Supposing Mukuṭa Rāi became a disciple of Nara Hari when he was aged about 25 years, the age of the King at the time of writing this book may be estimated at about 84 years. We also find in the History of Jessore and Khulnā that

two Mukṭa Rāi's died in conflict with the Mahomedan sages who came to Bengal to preach the Mahomedan faith. One of them had his capital near Jhināi Dahi in Jessore, and that he fought with the Pathan Governor, of Bengal. The other Mukṭa Rāi bearing the title Rāja had his capital at Brāhmannagar in Jessore and that he was finally overthrown by the army of Husein Shah, the Governor of Bengal. (*Vide* History of Jessore and Khulnā, pp. 379-81, 383-88.) But the Mukṭa Rāi mentioned by our poet is a person of the Mogul period. The material is so scanty that it is not possible to arrive at some definite conclusion if more documents be not available.

About the nature of the book. It is undoubtedly a Sahajiyā work of great importance. The date of the composition of the book gives us an opportunity to know definitely what the Sahajiyā doctrine was in the latter part of the 16th century, *i.e.*, about 350 years ago, within about 50 years of the passing away of Caitanya Deva. The pet theory of the Sahajiyās which is the fundamental principle of the cult even now-a-days, established itself firmly in the conception of the Sahajiyās even at that remote period, I mean the idea of being engaged in spiritual culture by transforming oneself into the nature of women. The establishment of this principle seems to be the object of the work under review. At the end of the book the poet says :—

প্রকৃতি কারণে লোক অমুভব করে ।
 বিচারিবে শুণ্ড গ্রাম্য কথা পরে ॥
 শক্তি শৈব সৌর আর বৈষ্ণবে জানিব ।
 জার জেন মত সেহি বিচারে পাইব ॥
 কবি দোষ ছাড়িয়া তব্দে দেহ মতি ।
 ভাবিয়া সংসার বন্ধ ছিড় শীঘ্র গতি ॥ P. 87.

“ Man gets in touch with higher spiritual truths by being accustomed to the adoption of the intensity of devotion so very peculiar to women. If you rightly think of it, you will find there is truth in this belief, and that it cannot be rejected as the unintelligible talk of the common village people. Even the followers of the four principal religious sects of the Hindus can be benefited in their own way if they get insight into this doctrine. You should look into the truth of the doctrine, but not to the defects of the

poet in proper exposition. If you follow this mode of spiritual culture you will soon be free from the bondage of the world."

The poet also alludes to the subject as a mystic doctrine, as in *সঙ্গোপণী রস কেহো উপভোগী*. (Here the line is defective in metre, showing that some word has been left out. Unfortunately the second manuscript is also very indistinct at this point.) However, there is no doubt that the author treated it as a mystic science.

The narration about the origin and source of the doctrine is also very peculiar. Our poet here maintains that this doctrine was first learnt by Dvāraka who taught it to Garga. Then came Suta and others. No Vaiṣṇava will claim these persons as the promulgator of their faith. The poet also says that in the Kali age this doctrine was taught by Rūpa and Sanātana to Banamālī, which marks the beginning of this spiritual culture (p. 86). In page 68, the author clearly says that the Vedic literature and even the Saṁhitās and works of the Rātra class failed to deal with this doctrine. This shows that the subject he treated was very different from that of the recognised Hindu and Vaiṣṇava Śāstras.

About language. The poet says—"প্রাকৃতে লিখিল তত্ত্ব সর্বজীব লাগি" (I have written about this doctrine in the Prākṛit language, so that it may be understood by all.) This shows that Bengali was at that time regarded as a form of Prākṛit.

About metre. The poet says—"পয়ারে লিখিল তত্ত্ব সরসকদম্ব" (p. 3). It is thus clear that the language is Prākṛit and the metre is Payāra. But he has made some distinction about different kinds of what he calls Payāra—

চতুর্দশ অক্ষরে লিখিল ক্ষুদ্র ছন্দ ।
ছাব্বিশ বিংশতি দ্বিঘ মধ্যম নিক্ক ॥

The long verse of Payāra contains twenty-six words, the medium contains twenty words, and the short fourteen words only. It should, thus, be observed that what is now regarded as Tripadi was at that time considered as a kind of Payāra.

THE POET KALIDAS AND SEA-VOYAGE.

BY

RAI PANKAJA KUMAR CHATTERJI, BAHADUR, M.A., B.L.,

District and Sessions Judge (Retired).

In the island of Ceylon one hears even now of an anecdote, probably many centuries old, about Kalidas's visit to the island, on the invitation of king Kumardas. Kalidas, it is said, complied with the request of the island king and crossed over to Ceylon. His stay there was unfortunately rather short. A famous courtesan lived in the island at the time. She was a great favourite of the King and received him often at her *boudoir*. On one of the walls of the chamber, the king who had achieved fame, far and wide, by his poem "Janakiharan" (abduction of Janaki) wrote, obviously when in a melting mood, the first half of a racy couplet (कमलात् कमलोत्पत्तिं श्रूयते न च दृश्यते—that from a lotus springs another is heard of but not seen) and challenged all who chose to complete it. A substantial reward besides was offered by way of attraction. The royal favourite, with her natural greed for money, was anxious to secure the prize. She could not herself satisfactorily compose the second half of the couplet. As fates would have it, one day Kalidas happened to stay at the house she lived in. He read the first line on the wall and pat came to his lips the second (बाले, तव मुखाभोजात् कथमिन्द्रीवरद्वयम्—dear girl, how could two blue lotuses spring from the lotus of your face). The verse, when completed and rounded off, pleased her immensely and she was quite convinced that the king would also read

it with the keenest and intensest pleasure. Love of money and uncontrollable avarice however clouded her reason and steeled her heart. To secure the prize she did not hesitate to resort to foul means. The poet was killed on the spot and his corpse hidden away. When the king visited her shortly after, she read out the completed couplet and tried to impress on him that to her it owed such an elegant ending. King Kumar was an admirable poet himself and could ill believe such an exquisitely fine line came from her. None but a gifted poet could, to his mind, have written it. He greatly doubted what the Ceylonese Aspasia said and asked insistently who was the real composer. Eventually he came to know that it was the great poet Kalidas who had added the second line. The infamous woman, not to lose the money she had set her heart on, had, it was soon discovered, foully murdered the famous poet. The grief of the king knew no bounds, as he entertained a very sincere and genuine admiration for the great poet whom he had come to regard as a friend and companion. His corpse was brought out of the crypt and all Ceylon headed by the king turned out to attend the funeral. When the funeral pyre was alit, the king in an ecstasy of uncontrollable grief, threw himself on the burning pile and two great poets of the age, whom chance had brought together, were consumed to ashes.

This episode in Kalidas's life may, I think, be seriously doubted. The warp and woof of the insular anecdote seem to be wild imagination—an intense desire to spin out some sort of a cobwebby connection between the island and the great poet whose equal there was none in classic India.

I do not intend, at present, to closely scrutinise this anecdote—to seek for far-flung evidence for its disproof. A careful examination of the plays and poems of the immortal poet will, it is hoped, afford sufficient internal evidence that, in all likelihood, he never sailed out to the broad seas. If

I succeed in showing that the poet was, to all intents and purposes, a land-lubber, the bottom of the Ceylonese anecdote will, in a large measure, be knocked out.

In the first place, I shall turn to the great epic *Raghubamsam*. There is a very charming description of a foaming and billowy sea over which the great hero Rama and his rescued wife Sita flew, in a car celestial, on to the mainland (see stanzas 1 to 18, Canto XIII of the *Raghubamsam*—from अथात्मनः शब्दगुणं गुणत्रयं to सकानना निष्पततीव भूमिः). An English translation of these verses may here, with advantage, be given :—

“Bishnu, who then bore the name of Rama and knew all about the sea and other things, rose up in a celestial car to the sky where had rested his feet once before and which possesses besides the special attribute of resonance. He asked his consort Sita, in a manner to be heard by her alone, ‘please look at the sea, the home of countless gems.’

See the seething mass of waters divided by my causeway right up to the Malaya mountain, as if the starry, clear autumnal heaven has been divided by the milky way.

Kapil having sent away into the nether world, the anointed horse of our ancestor (Sagar) who wished to perform a great sacrifice, his sons (our predecessors) dug down deep into the earth and thus widened the expanse of the ocean. From this ocean the rays of the Sun draw in water to fill their wombs with (clouds are formed); in it grow many rare gems; and it has also brought forth the Moon whose beams shed cheerfulness.

Like Bishnu himself, the general appearance of the ocean is unascertainable, so far as variability and limit go: it assumes too many shapes, as through its inborn energy it extends to the ten directions.

The great God Bishnu lapses into a profound ecstatic sleep at the end of an æon, the universe itself being reduced

to nothingness. The primeval creator (Brahma) seated on a lotus sprouting out of his navel prays all the while to the great God who lies afloat on the ocean. Hundreds of mountains, robbed of their pride by Indra, the clipper of wings, approach for shelter this ocean their protector, as do kings, when hard pressed by enemies, a neutral potentate.

When the primeval boar (Bishnu) raised up the earth from the nether regions deep down, with a view to matrimony, the waters of the ocean, swelled by the cataclysmal deluge, served for a spell the purposes of a bridal veil.

This ocean who knows well how to offer his lips, transformed into rippling waves, and whose winsome ways besides with his sweethearts eschew the beaten track, kisses the many rivers, naturally a little too eager to turn up their faces to him. He allows himself also to be kissed by them in return.

These whales drink water full of living beings from the mouths of rivers with jaws wide open, close them anon and throw up jets of water through their nostrils. Behold ! the foams of the sea are cleft in two by huge marine animals, suddenly jumping out of the waves. Foams dripping from their temples look for a time like white-haired whiskers near about the ears.

Indistinguishable from huge foam-crested waves are the serpents which stretch themselves out to inhale the breeze flowing from the land. The gems on their hoods, brighter from contact with the rays of the sun, betray, however, their identity.

On coral reefs, which strive to emulate your red lips, are suddenly thrown, by the rush of waves, these shoals of conches, their mouths closely shut from contact with things spiky and slowly and painfully do they crawl away.

No sooner the clouds begin to drink off the waters of the sea than they are turned away by whirling eddies and

the boundless deep looks very much, as if it were churned again by the steep hill Mandar.

The thin coastline, fringed blue by clusters of palm and *tamāl* trees, of the briny sea—a huge hoop of iron—looks from afar like the black mucky rim of a wheel.

Oh large-eyed beauty ! the breeze from the beach salutes you with the pollens of *Ketak* flowers. It knows, as it were, that I, who am very eager to press your red lips, can ill put up with delay in your toilette.

We have, by means of the fast-flying car found almost in no time, the far shore of the sea, besprinkled with many pearls ejected by oysters opening out their valves on coming into contact with the uneven sandy beach—a shoreline fringed besides with nut trees bending under the weight of fruits.

Oh beautiful lady, whose thighs curve out like the lateral end of a palm of hand and whose eyes resemble those of a deer, look back on the route just traversed. You will see wooded land emerging, as it were, from the sea which fades more and more away into a hazy distance."

The verses quoted above point, in no small measure, to the legendary lore of the poet. He spoke of *Sagar* whose sons were believed to have excavated the circumambient seas. The God Bishnu who lay asleep on the sea atop a big serpent was also mentioned. Nor did he forget the primeval boar who was reputed to have raised the earth from the dark unfathomed caves of the nether world when, after the deluge, there was but water all round. Indra, the head of minor divinities, who clipped the wings of all supercilious mountains, was also pointedly referred to. Those who sought to escape his fury, dived deep down, it was said, into the broad seas. *Mandar*, a famous hill, which was said to have churned the vast ocean in the dim past, was also called to mind. All this goes to show that the poet Kalidas was well read in the epics and old chronicles

(*Purans*) of ancient India. But it goes no further : there is nothing in legends to show that the poet had any first-hand knowledge of the sea.

All that the poet could call to mind when describing the sea may now be closely examined. I shall, in the first place, refer to the sea animals the poet spoke of. There was mention of whales which at the mouths of rivers drank up water full of live creatures and spouted it out—strained and filtered—through the nostrils. That the poet knew of whales and their peculiar characteristics cannot seriously be doubted. Whales come very seldom to the tropical seas but occasionally, it may be conceded, they do. When a fierce gale or a blinding blizzard blows hard and the sea is lashed into a mad fury, they might at times drift away from the frigid zones. Be that as it may, the poet, it is sufficiently clear, never saw these huge mammals, if he saw them at all, out on the deep seas far away from the shore. The compound word (नदीमुखान्नः)—the waters of the mouth of a river—clearly indicates that the poet, if he ever saw them, must have seen them in the mouth of a river, close to the seaboard. What other marine animals did the poet speak of? They were, so far as I can see, conches, coral reefs and pearl oysters. Conch-shells and pearl oysters bestrewed the sea-beach—that was what the poet said. The pearl oysters came in fierce contact with the coral reefs and closed their mouths. All this goes to show how the sea beach looked but there was not the faintest attempt to describe the booming sea, far off from the land. If there were coral reefs in the briny sea (लवणाम्बुराशि) round about ancient India, it seems, they existed not far from the littoral. Otherwise their fierce clash with pearl oysters near about the seashore is simply inexplicable.

It is true the poet also compared huge sea serpents with foam-crested waves of the sea. Yarns about mile-long sea serpents are heard of even now and what little the poet

said about huge ophidians bears a striking similarity to them. But that Kalidas never put to sea is sufficiently clear from that exquisitely fine stanza (दूरादयश्चक्रनिभस्य तन्वी, etc.), which described, it seems, the estuary of a big river and not the boundless sea where there was but "water, water everywhere." In short, the above description of the sea—the longest that the poet wrote—goes to show at most that he might have cast his eyes on the world of waters at the mouths of large rivers which fell into gulfs or bays but never sailed out to the broad sea from where the shoreline was completely invisible.

I may also observe here that about pearls and conches he obviously got his cue from the great epic Ramayana. The epic was very likely before his mind's eye when he essayed a description of the sea. The line I refer to may be translated as follows :—

"Resounding, as if uncrossable, full of conches and oysters" (अपारमिव गर्जन्तं शङ्खशुक्तिसमाकुलम्; *vide* Ramayana, Lankakanda, Chapter 124).

I now propose to scour through the poems and plays of the great poet Kalidas and pounce upon such passages as bear on the sea. The main question for consideration is how far do they point to his being a seafarer? The great epic *Raghubansa* may be tapped once again.

From the third canto of the epic, a single line may be culled (नदीमुखेनैव समुद्रमाविशत् : stanza 28—as one reaches the sea through the mouth of a river). It does not go to show more than that rivers flow into the open sea. The fourth canto, however, affords more matter for reflection. The first line I refer to occurs in stanza 32 [स सेनां महतीं कर्षन् पूर्वसागर-गामिनीम्; he (Raghu) led his mighty army on towards the eastern sea]. What little can be gathered from it goes to show that the poet knew that India was washed by the sea on the east. In stanza 34 one comes across the following line "प्राप तालीवनश्याममुपकण्ठं महीदधेः" (reached the shore of

the ocean rendered dark by a forest of palm trees). There also the poet referred to the coastal region and went no further. Stanza 44 next courts attention, [ततो विलातटेनैव, etc., etc., अनाशास्य जयो ययौ—Then he (Raghu) went by the sea-beach, fringed with nut trees full of fruits, towards the south without the least solicitude for victory]. It goes to show, at most, that the eastern littoral in southern India was full of flowering nut trees. There also the poet spoke of the sea-beach and not of the deep sea. Then follows a rather striking couplet [ताम्रपर्णीसमेतस्य मुक्तासारं, etc., etc., यशः स्वमिव सञ्चितम् : stanza 50—they (the people of Pandu) bowed low and handed over to him (Raghu), like fame carefully stored up till then, the finest pearls gathered from where the river Tamraparni flowed into the sea]. From these lines, it appears, that there was a pearl-fishery in good old days at the mouth of the river Tamraparni. It was obviously a south Indian river in the Tinnevely district of Madras. The island of Ceylon bore that name sometime in ancient India—at any rate during the reign of Asoka when he established his sway all over India and beyond. Stanza 58 of the same canto may now be scanned [अवकाशं किलोदन्वान्, etc., etc., रघवे करम्—the sea had, on request, previously made room for Parasuram but now paid tribute to Raghu through the kings of far-off isles (Aparanta)]. This stanza, to my mind, goes a long way to show that the poet was a landsman. If he had ever sailed across the sea, he would have felt, in all likelihood, an almost irresistible temptation to portray a sea-voyage in glowing colours and Raghu and his army would very probably have sailed in warships to those far-off isles to subjugate them *vi et armis*. But the poet, to avoid very probably that of which he knew next to nothing, made those island princes cross over and tamely pay tribute to the victorious Raghu. The lines quoted nearly clinch the question of the poet's inexperience of the sea.

A few stanzas of the sixth canto—a canto where Indumatī

chose Aja as her consort from a vast concourse of royal suitors—may now be referred to (*vide* stanzas 52, 56, 57, 60, 61, 63 and 85): “Like a river flowing down to the sea, when it meets a high hill on the way” (महीधरं मार्गवशादुपेतम् स्रोतोवद्वा सागररगामिनौव, stanza 52). This line discloses no knowledge of the sea: it merely shows that the poet knew that all rivers ran into the sea. People who live in landlocked places are also aware that rivers drop into the sea.

There are two more stanzas close by (56 and 57) to which I may refer in passing. They describe a royal palace against which beat the waves of the sea, plainly visible from its deep embrasures. The sea-beach, fringed by murmuring palms, offers, it is said, an ideal lover’s promenade. There blows over the delightful walk breeze from the far-off spicy islands. These verses relate to the sea-board and do not go to show that the poet had any knowledge of the mid-ocean—that he ever sailed out to the deep sea. Stanzas 61 and 63 of the same canto allude but faintly to the sea. In one of them there is a reference to the sage Agastya who was reputed to have sucked the ocean dry and then disgorged the waters back. In the other, there is but a casual allusion to the circumambient sea full of rare gems. The last verse in this canto (85) refers to a commonplace: the river Ganges flows into the sea is all that one finds there.

In the seventh canto of the Raghubamsa there is but a solitary reference to the sea. In stanza 19 the rays of the new moon are said to have, as if led beguilingly on the foam-crested sea to the shore. In stanza 17, canto III of the same epic, there is a line of a very similar import (महीदधेः पुर, etc., etc., प्रवभुव नात्मनि). This phenomenon is referred to by the poet in more places than one. In fact the very same line (stanza 19, canto VII of the Raghubansam) is repeated in stanza 73, canto VII of the Kumar-sambhabam. A similar line also occurs in canto III of the

above epic (चन्द्रोदयारम्भ इवाम्बुराशि, etc). That on either a full moon or a new moon day waters of the sea swell up and rush shorewards is widely known to almost 'all who live by the sea or tidal rivers. Such a knowledge may also infiltrate inland. A fact so well-known does not, to be sure, point to the poet being a seafarer. In stanza 33, canto VIII of the great epic (Raghubamsam) there is but one stanza in which the shores of the south sea are incidentally mentioned : a temple of the god *Siva* stood in a seaside town and that was the poet's objective. By south sea he obviously meant the portion of the Indian ocean which encompassed southern India. In stanza 14, canto IX of the above epic the shores of the great ocean are referred to, to show that when king Dasarath had won many battles and crushed his enemies, he turned from the seaside towards his capital Ajodhya—a city of unequalled beauty.

Canto XII has already been laid under contribution. The longest description of the sea is found there. In stanza 39, canto XIV the poet spoke of the earth rimmed by the sea (समुद्रनेमि). Average humanity know of the circumambient sea and no wonder that a cultured poet like Kalidas knew it too. In canto XVI there was an allusion to the sea, churned of yore (समुद्रादिव मथ्यमानात्)—an obvious attempt at reviving an old tradition. It was done once before in canto XIII.

In stanza 54 of canto XVII the poet spoke of sea water in high tide having but one ingress through the mouths of rivers (वृद्धौ नदीमुखेनैव प्रस्थानं लवणान्धसः). This fact is, in all likelihood, known to all who live on river banks or near about. At any rate, it does not go to show that the poet sailed out far off from the ports. In the last stanza of the above canto the poet spoke of a placid sea fit for navigation (यादोनाथः शिवजलपथः कर्मणे नौचरणाम्). That navigation is easy in a calm sea was and is the common knowledge of all.

Now the great epic *Kumarasambhavam* (कुमारसम्भवम्) may well be tapped. Very few verses in that grand poem bear on the sea. In the very opening line, there is, it seems, a reference to the sea. The great mountain Himalaya, the poet said, was bounded by the sea on the east and west (पूर्वोपरौ तोयनिधौ वगाच्च). It goes to show, at most, that the poet knew that there were seas both on the east and west of the long chain of snow-clad, high-peaked mountains, collectively known in Sanskrit as the Himalaya. The two verses which relate to the swell of the sea by lunar action have already been referred to (canto III, stanza 67 and canto VII, stanza 73). In stanza 69, canto VI the rivers issuing from the Himalaya were described rhetorically as having met with no resistance whatever from the waves of the sea or in plain words, as having peacefully glided into the sea (समुद्रोर्ध्वनिवारिता). This is all that, I find, in the famous epic. Surely there are no realistic touches in the poem to suggest that the poet ever undertook a sea-voyage. In the shorter poems *Meghadutam* (मेघदूतम्) and *Ritusamhara* (ऋतुसंहारः) there was, so far as I could see, no mention of the sea. In the one, the poet recorded his experiences of the several seasons and in the other, he attempted to suggest a route to the cloud messenger from the hill Ramgiri to Alaka, the alpine city of Kuvera, the chief of the Yakshas.

I may now turn to the dramas of the great poet. Do they suggest that the poet ever crossed the sea? I do not think they do.

In the Bengali Edition of the famous drama (*Abhijnana-Sakuntalam*) there is mention of submarine fire within the sea (त्वयि ज्वलत्योर्ध्वं इव अम्बुराशौ, see Act III). In the *Raghubamsam*, there is also a reference to such a fire (अवन्निर्गमसो विभर्ति—canto XIII). In the Bombay Edition of the famous drama, the line quoted is not found. In the seventh Act of the drama, the king Dusyanta addressed the charioteer as follows :—

“Matali ! What is this mountain that is bounded by seas on the east and west and sheds, like evening clouds, molten gold ?” (मातले कतमोऽयं पूर्वापरसमुद्रावगाढ, etc., etc). This line describes a mountain whose east and west ends are washed by seas. It reminds one of the opening line in *Kumara-sambhavam* (पूर्वापरौ तोयनिधी वगाह्य). There is nothing in it to show that the great poet ever left *terra firma* and knew what pitching and rolling were in a boisterous sea.

Now *Malabikagnimitram*, another drama of the poet may be examined for a while. In the first Act there is an allusion to a popular belief, *viz.*, rainwater when it falls into the valves of sea oysters turns into exquisitely bright pearls. There is nothing in the line (जलमिव समुद्रगुह्यौ मुक्ताफलतां पयोदस्य) to suggest that the poet had any personal experience of the sea, calm or ruffled.

Another line, with a passing allusion to the sea, is found in the last act of the play (अन्यसरितामपि जलं समुद्रगाः प्रापयन्तु उदधिम्). It only goes to show that rivers carry to the sea waters of other rivers also; *i.e.*, large rivers into which fall many tributaries pour their massed volume of water into the sea. There is nothing in it, to say the least, to suggest that the poet was ever on board a sea-going vessel or sailed far away from the offing. He reiterated facts, well-known to people who lived inland. That broad rivers with many tributaries eventually fell into the sea was but common knowledge.

Now I may pass on to the other well-known play (*Bikram-orbashi*). In the fourth Act, the insane king trills out a blurred and confused picture of sea and river, charming none the less. His mind runs back to the blue waters of a billowy sea, when a river bursts on his sight. The pretty birds that disport themselves on rivers do not, however, completely pass out of his mental vision. So there is a sweet confusion in the picture depicted. A rather free translation of the lines I refer to is given below :—

“The king of the seas, with blue waters, not unlike clouds, dances charmingly with his hand uplifted : stirred by the east wind, the sea breaks out into billows, which look like a hand upraised. He has wrapped himself up in ducks, wee birds called *chakrabak*, conches, tortoises, sea-elephants, huge fish named *makar*, besides blue waters. The waves that dash against the shore are the palms of his hands : he keeps time by clapping them. Like the season of newly formed clouds, he looks and spreads himself on all sides in a manner to close up the ten directions” (see from पूर्वदिशा पवनाह्वय, etc., etc., दशदिश रुन्धेइ नवमेघशालु).

From this picturesquely quaint description of the sea, it appears, that the poet knew that sea-water was deep blue in colour, that when an easterly wind blew the sea became rough, that it contained all sorts of wild marine animals, not to speak of sea-shells and conches. Nor was he unaware of the boom of the waves on the sandy beaches.

One more line that I need mention is found towards the close of the fifth Act (हिमवति जलधौ च प्राप्ततोयिव गङ्गा). The poet knew, it seems, that the river Ganges rose from the Himalayas and fell into the sea. People who lived inland might well have been aware of such a broad fact.

To conclude. If one seeks for internal evidence in the plays and poems of the great poet, there is nothing to show, beyond doubt, that he was a sailor or sea-farer. His knowledge of the sea consisted of a few commonplaces which all landsmen of some culture might know. A few old traditions gathered from epics and chronicles, a few proverbial sea animals always associated with the sea, beaches covered with shells, conches and oysters, coral reefs near about the shore, cool breezes that blew from spicy islands across the seas into pleasant sandy seaside walks, the influence of the moon on the sea, the immersion of down-flowing rivers into deep seas, the existence of seas on the east and west of India—these, in fact, are the sum total of his knowledge of the sea.

It seems, therefore, that the great poet lived inland and wandered, if at all, up to the mouth of large rivers. It is hard to believe that he ever crossed over to Ceylon or died there. The insular anecdote, referred to above, finds scanty support, on a close scrutiny of such internal evidence as the works of the poet afford.

DATE OF KAVIKANKAN MUKUNDARĀM CAKRAVARTĪ.

BY

BASANTAKUMAR CHATTERJEE, M.A.

In some of the editions of the immortal work of the Bengali poet Mukundarām, we have the following couplet mentioning the date of its first conception in the mind of the poet ;—“শকে রস-রস-বেদ-শশাঙ্ক গণিতা। কত দিনে দিলা গীত হরের বনিতা ॥” The word রস (rasa) is usually a technical term for the number ‘*six*,’ বেদ (veda) for ‘*four*’ and শশাঙ্ক (śaśaṅka) for ‘*one*’; so the phrase রস-রস-বেদ-শশাঙ্ক (*lit. six-six-four-one*) should mean the number 1466, as, according to the Sanskrit method, we have to read the digits from the right to the left. The Śaka year 1466 corresponds to 1544-5 A.D. (March to April) which is about fifty years earlier than the time of Mān Siṅha, the Subadār of Bengal who is mentioned by the poet as the ruler of Bengal and as a pious Vaiṣṇav (ধন্য রাজা মানসিংহ, বিষ্ণু-পদাশ্রয়ভূক্ত, গোড়-বন্ধ-উৎকল-অধিপ।). Rāi Sāheb Nagendranāth Vasu Prācyavidyāmahārṇav rejects this date-couplet as non-genuine, because, he thinks, it represents a date far away from the time of Mān Siṅha who was the ruler of Gauḍa, Baṅga and Utkal at the time when our poet composed his monumental work. Rāi Bāhādur Dr. Dineshchandra Sen accepts the phrase ‘রস-রস-বেদ-শশাঙ্ক’ to mean the Christian year 1577, but he does not explain how he comes by that interpretation of the phrase. It is plain, however, that he accepts the word রস to mean the number ‘*nine*’ and not ‘*six*’ which is the more usual signification of the term in such phrases. This gives him the Śaka year 1499, which corresponds to the Christian year 1577, which, he rightly thinks, was the time when Mukundarām had his dream in which the goddess appeared before him in person and ordered him to compose a song in her praise.

Although the word রস is usually used to mean ‘*six*’ by reference to the six primary *tastes* মধুর (honey-like), অম্ল (acid), লবণ (salt),

কটুক (pungent), তিক্ত (bitter), and কষায় (astringent), it may be used symbolically for the number 'nine' also, if it refers to the nine sentiments defined in Sanskrit works on rhetorics, viz., শৃঙ্গার (love), হাস্য (mirth), করুণ (pity), রোদ্র (fury), বীর (heroism), ভয়ানক (terror), বীভৎস (disgust), অদ্ভুত (wonder) and শান্ত (tranquillity). As the poet was well-versed in Sanskrit learning, and has drawn the materials of his poem from the Sanskrit *purāṇs*, it would be more natural for him to pick out his phraseology from works on Sanskrit rhetorics. In support of this supposition of mine I meet with an expression in the poem itself where the poet speaks of the *nine rasas*.

“প্রবেশিলে একাদশে, মদন হৃদয়ে বসে,
নব রস হয় এক স্থান ॥”

—খুল্লনার বিবাহ-প্রস্তাব।

“When a girl attains the age of eleven, Cupid occupies her heart, and all the nine sentiments are fully developed in the one heart.” This internal evidence is conclusive of my conjecture that the poet means the number *nine* by the symbolic term ‘*rasa*.’

But we know from history that Mān Siṅha became Subadār of Bengal in 1589 A.D. and that Orissa was annexed to Bengal in the year 1592-93 A.D. Therefore, the date 1577 A.D. as denoted by the couplet শাকে রস etc, is 16 years earlier than the date in which Mān Siṅha might be described as the ruler of Gauḍa, Baṅga, and Utkal (গৌড়-বঙ্গ-উৎকল-অধিপ). This can be explained only if we suppose 1577 A.D. to be the date of the poet's fleeing away from his home at Dāmuniyā in the district of Burdwan to Āraḍā in the district of Midnāpur, when, in his way, he saw the dream in which the goddess ordered him to compose the song. This agrees with the literal meaning of the date couplet.

This interpretation is also supported from internal evidence.

“সুধা বাঁকুড়া রায়, তাজিল সকল দায়,
সুত-পাশে কৈল নিয়োজিত।
তার সুত রঘুনাথ, রূপে গুণে অবদাত
গুরু করি করিল পূজিত ॥”

—গ্রন্থোৎপত্তির কারণ।

“Blessed be Bākuḍā Rāy, who put an end to all my troubles and appointed me for (the education of) his son. His son, Raghunāth, beautiful in appearance and endowed with eminent qualities honoured me as his teacher.” This brings us to the conclusion that when the poet came to Āraḍā, the ruling king was Bākuḍā Rāy who appointed the poet as tutor of his son, Raghunāth. But when the poet composes the poem, Bākuḍā Rāy is dead, and his son, Raghunāth, is king, to whom the poet has been in the meantime appointed as the court-poet.

রাজা রঘুনাথ, গুণে অবদাত, রসিক মাঝে সুজ্ঞান ।

তার সভাসদ, রচি চারু পদ, শ্রীকবিকঙ্কণ গান ॥

“King Raghunāth, accomplished in all arts, is well known among witty persons ; his courtier, Śrī Kavikankaṇ, composes beautiful verses and sings.”

পালধি বংশেতে জাত,

বিক্রপতি রঘুনাথ

সভাসদ শ্রীকবিকঙ্কণ ।

“Raghunāth, the Lord of all twice-born, has been born in the Pālādhi family : Śrī Kavikankaṇ is his courtier.”

শ্রীরঘুনাথ নাম, অশেষ গুণধাম, ব্রাহ্মণভূমের পুরন্দর ।

তাহার সভাসদ, রচিয়া চারুপদ, মুকুন্দ গান কবিবর ॥

“Śrī Raghunāth is his name, he is the abode of infinite good qualities, and is the Indra, as it were, of the land of Brāhmaṇs. His courtier, the great poet Mukunda sings in beautiful verses composed by himself.”

The poet gives indication of the fact that much time had passed since his divine vision before the poem was actually composed, and that he was repeatedly reminded of his divine vision by his companion Dāmodar Nandī, and that the king Raghunāth requested him daily to compose the song.

সঙ্গে দামোদর নন্দী, যে জানে স্বপনসন্ধি, অমুদিন করিত যতন ।

নিত্য দেন অমুমতি, রঘুনাথ নরপতি, নায়কেরে দিলেন ভূষণ ॥

“My companion Dāmodar Nandī was aware of the secret of the divine dream and encouraged (me) every day. The King Raghunāth uttered his royal request every day and gave jewels to the poet.”

Rāi Bāhādur Dr. Dineshchandra Sen notes the year 1589 A.D., the year in which Mān Singha was appointed Subadār of Bengal, as the date in which the work of Mukundarām was composed. But the mention of the adjective "Lord of Gauḍa, Banga and Utkal" (গৌড়-বঙ্গ-উৎকল-অধিপ) requires us to assume a date subsequent to the annexation of Orissa (1592-93) by Mān Singha. Rāi Sāheb Nagendranāth Vasu informs us that he has got a manuscript copy of the *cantisā* which is said to have been composed in the Śaka year 1515 corresponding to the Christian year 1593-94.

চাপ্য-ইন্দু-বাণ-সিদ্ধ (? ইন্দু) শক নিয়োজিত ।

পঞ্চবিংশে মেঘ অংশে চৌতিসা পূর্ণিত ॥

It would therefore be not unreasonable to suppose that the whole work was finished some time after the year 1593-94 A.D., say in 1594 or 1595.

The poet has mentioned the names of some great men and some poets who preceded him, and these must be taken into consideration in determining the age in which he flourished. Śrīcāitanya, Śacī Thākuraṇi, Nityānanda, Purandar Miśra, Śārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, Rāmakṛṣṇa, Gadādhara, Gauridās, Mukunda, Jaydev, Vidyāpati, Māṇik-datta, Śrī Kavikāṇkaṇ (Balarām Kavikāṇkaṇ) and many other names have been mentioned, some of whom cannot be identified.

The poet appears to have flourished at an age when the Portuguese had already settled in Bengal (A.D. 1530 to 1540). There is mention of the Portuguese pirates (ফিরাক্কীর দেশখান বাহে কর্ণধারে । রাজিতে বাহিয়া যায় হারামদের ডরে ॥), of potato (আলু, কচু, শাক পাত, আর যত বস্তু জাত, নিম্ন চারি কাহন দশ পণে । and রোহিতে কুমুড়া বড়ি আলু দিয়া খোল ॥) and, in some editions, of *hukā* the apparatus for smoking tobacco as a thing of curiosity.

চক্ষু আছে মুখ আছে নাহি তার পা ।

সভাকার হাথে থাকে কৃষ্ণবর্ণ গা ॥

শিরের উপরি থাকি করয়ে আহার ।

ত্রীকবিকঙ্কণে ভণে হিঁয়ালির সার ॥

"It has eyes and face but no legs. It is carried by all men in the hand, and has a dark body. It takes its food from above the head. Śrī Kavikāṇkaṇ says the cream of conundrums."

and

যোগী নয়, সন্ন্যাসী নয়, মাথায় হুতাশন ।

ছেলে নয়, পিলে নয়, ডাকে ঘনে ঘন ।

চোর নয়, ডাকাত নয়, বশী মারে বুকে ।

কন্যা নয়, পুত্র নয়, চুমা খায় তার মুখে ॥

"It is not a mendicant nor a man who has renounced the world but carries fire on the head. It is not a child nor one of its kind but cries again and again. It is not a thief nor a robber but is pierced through with a spear. It is neither a daughter nor a son, but is kissed on the lips."

Potato and tobacco came to India from America with the Portuguese and I have seen a portrait of Akbar in council with his nine jewels (নবরত্ন) in which Akbar has been smoking from a *forsi* with a long pipe. This brings us to the end of the 16th century. The absence of the name of *ananas* which had been introduced into the court of Akbar, indicates that it had not yet been popular in Bengal : it was still used only as an article of luxury by wealthy people.

There is another very important point to be considered in this connection, *viz.*, the anarchical condition of Bengal which compelled the poet to leave his native village in Burdwan and travel to the court of Bākūṣā Rāy at Āraḍā in Midnāpur which was in the border land between Bengal and Orissa and was under a Hindu ruler.

সহর সিলিমাবাজ,

তাহাতে সজ্জনরাজ,

নিবসে নিয়োগী গোপীনাথ ।

তাহার তালুকে বসি,

দামুহায় চাষ চবি

নিবাস পুরুষ ছয় সাত ॥

ধন্য রাজা মানসিংহ,

বিকুপদাম্বুজভুজ,

গৌড়-বঙ্গ-উৎকল-অধিপ ।

অধর্মী রাজার কালে (পাঠান্তর, সে মানসিংহের কালে), প্রজার পাপের ফলে,

ডিহিদার মামুদ সরিপ ॥

উজির হৈলা রায়জাদা,

বেপারিরে দেয় খেদা,

ব্রাহ্মণ বৈষ্ণবের হল অরি ।

কোণে কোণে দিয়া দড়া,

পনর কাঠায় কুড়া,

নাহি শুনে প্রজার গোহারি ॥

purchase. Gopīnāth Nandī, our landlord, became entrapped through ill-luck with no hope of a release. The guards were ever-vigilant and stationed themselves at the very doors lest the tenants should flee away. The tenants became perplexed and sold off their household hatchets: an article worth a rupee was sold off for ten annas.

* * * *

While I was fleeing away from Dāmungā and my brother Rāmānanda was in accompaniment, the goddess Candī made her appearance on the way."

This recalls to us the picture of Bengal at the time of Daood Khan (1573-77) who was "addicted to wine and bad company, forsook the prudent measures of his father; and assuming all the insignia of royalty, ordered the *Khutbeh* to be proclaimed in his own name through all the towns of Bengal and Behar; and directed the coin to be stampd with his own title; thus completely setting at defiance the authority of the Emperor Akbar." During his rule, the whole of Bengal and Bihar was the scene of continual warfare between the Pathan and the Mughal soldiers, and anarchy prevailed everywhere, and there was a great pestilence in the capital city of Bengal. Much better was the condition of Bengal during the reign of his prudent father, Suleimān Kerrany who "by his politic conduct enjoyed a quiet and peaceable reign and died at his new capital (Tondah) in the year 981 H. (1573 A.D.), much regretted by his subjects, and highly respected by all his contemporaries." After the death of Daood, Bengal came under the direct rule of Emperor Akbar, who by his wise policy of co-operation with the Hindus, made his Bengali subjects feel that there had been a welcome change in the administration of the country. The Hindu generals and rulers, Todar Mall and Mān Sinha, were much liked by the Hindu population of Bengal, and it is to Mān Sinha that the poet bestows the highest rank of Hinduism (বিস্ব-পদাযুক্ত-ভূক) "Black-bee at the lotus-feet of Viṣṇu." From about 1586 A.D. up to the end of Akbar's rule, the jāigir-dār of Burdwan was a very pious man, Sher Afghan, who was popular among all his subjects, Hindus and Mahomedans alike. In the *Ain-i-Akbari* (c. 1590 A.D.) we find the name of Sarkār Sharifābād under which Burdwan was a *mahal* or *parganā*. Some of the *parganās* under the Sarkār Sharifābād were Azmatshahi, Dheyā, Manoharshahi,

Khaṇḍaghosh, and Bāgha. We must therefore suppose that the Māmud Sarip of the poet, after whom the Sarkār Sharifābād appears to have been named, must have belonged to the time of Daood, and neither before nor after his time. This is in accordance with the date 1577 A.D. (শাকের বদ-বদ-বেদ-শাক গণিত) when the poet is said to have left his native home and come to the court of Bākuḍā Rāy in Midnāpur. Of the two readings “অধর্মী রাজার কালে” and “সে মানসিংহের কালে,” I would prefer the former reading which is indicative of a contrast between the past and the present; and if the latter be accepted, it would represent a memory picture of the poet which continues the events of the past to the present time when perhaps Māmud Sarip does not continue as the *Dihidār*. The poet praises the present ruler Mān Siṅha who is a Hindu and said to be a good Vaiṣṇav, as well. ¹

These circumstances are sufficient, I think, to come to the conclusion that the poet left his native home in the year 1576-77 A.D., when the country was in a state of anarchy and was neither under the Mughals, nor under the Pathans, both of whose soldiers were engaged in constant warfare and plunder. When he came to the court of Bākuḍā Rāy, he felt a great relief and spent his days in the education of the prince, Raghunāth, to whom he must have spoken of his divine vision ordering him to compose a song in praise of the Devī. When on the death of his father, Raghunāth ascended the throne, he requested the poet, who was now his court-poet, to compose the poem. The poem was finally composed in about the year 1594-95 A.D., when Mān Siṅha was ruling as Subadār of Gauḍa, Baṅga and Utkal.

¹ The genealogical table of the Royal Family of Āraḍā Brāhmaṇ-land, which allots to Raghunāth a reign of 30 years from 1573 to 1603 A.D., as noted by Rāmgati Nyāyaratna in his Bangabhāṣā O Sāhityaṇṣayak prastāb, is apparently erroneous.

PADĀVALĪ LITERATURE (পদাবলী সাহিত্য)

VIDYĀPATI (বিজ্ঞাপতি)

BY

BASANTAKUMAR CHATTERJEE, M.A.

Vidyāpati is one of our earliest padāvalī poets whose learned songs had at one time charmed the people of Northern India, and especially Bengal. Śrīcaitanya-dev was very fond of the sweet songs of the great bard of Mithilā. A large section of our padāvalī poets drew inspiration from Vidyāpati¹ and in consequence there grew up an artificial literary language known as the '*Braja-buli*' which is neither Maithilī, nor Hindī, nor a language actually belonging to any geographical area at any particular period of time. In it we find a curious combination of Maithilī and Hindī forms together with a number of forms and idioms which belong to neither : these new creations are met with only in the language of the particular section of padāvalī songs of Bengal.

In order to be able to properly appreciate the songs of our great poet we must first be acquainted with the life history of the poet and the social and political condition of Mithilā of his time. Unfortunately for us, the poet has not left us an autobiography, and the political history of the time has not yet been

¹ Govindadās

বিজ্ঞাপতি পদ ষুগল সরোরুহ
নিষাদিত মকরন্দে ।
তছু মনু মানস মাতল মধুকর
পিবইতে কর অমুবক্ষে ॥

Padakalpataru, B. S. P. edition
vol. I, p. 9.

Vaishnavdās :

জয় জয়দেব কবি নুপতি শিরোমণি
বিজ্ঞাপতি রস ধাম ।
জয় জয় চণ্ডী- দাস রসশেখর
অখিল ভুবনে অমুপাম ।

Ibid p. 12.

definitely known. We are therefore to study first of all what materials are available from the works of the poet himself for the ascertainment of his age.

Kīrtīlatā (কীর্তিলতা), a historical poem in 4 cantos is popularly believed to have been the earliest of Vidyāpati's works. It relates the story of Virasimha and Kirtisimha who went to the court of Ibrāhim Shāh at Jaunpur (জোনাপুর) to seek the help of the great Mahomedan ruler to punish one Turuṣka named Asalān who had killed their father, Gagan Rāy or Gaganēś Rāy (not Gaṇēś as is usually believed) in the year 252 L. S. corresponding to 1372 A.D.¹ In this work, Vidyāpati speaks highly of the Brāhmaṇ dynasty of kings known as the *Oēnī Vamśa* wherein such a great king as *Kāmeśvar* was born. *Bhogīś Rāy* was his son and had been honoured by Feroz Shāh Tughlak (1353-1388 A.D.) who called him পিতৃসখা (dear friend).² *Bhogīś Rāy's* son *Gaṇēś Rāy* or *Gaṇa Rāy* was killed treacherously by a Turuṣka of the name of *Asalān* for greed of kingdom on the 5th day of the first lunar half of the month of Madhu (Caitra) in the year 252 of king Lakṣmaṇ Sen (1372 A.D.). His two sons *Virasimha* and *Kīrtisimha* of whom the latter was more meritorious, went to the court of *Ibrāhim Shāh* of Jaunpur (জোনাপুর) for help against their enemy. *Ibrāhim Shāh* and *Mahmūd* came to Tirhut to help them, and with their help the two brothers were able to capture the kingdom of their father from *Asalān* who was defeated but not killed. We

¹ “লক্ষণ সেন নরেশ লিহিজবে পঞ্চ^২ পঞ্চ^৩ বে ।

তদ্বহমাসহি পঢ়ম পঞ্চ পঞ্চমী কহিঅজে ॥

রজ্জলু অসলান বুদ্ধিবলে হারল ।

পাস বইসি বিসবাসি রাএ গএ নেসর মারল ।”

Kīrtīlatā, p. 7, H. P. Śāstri's edition.

“লক্ষণ সেন নরেশ লিহিজবে পঞ্চ পঞ্চ^২ বে ।

তম গহ মাসহি পঢ়ম পঞ্চ পঞ্চমী কহিঅজে ॥

রজ্জ লু অসলান বুদ্ধি ভিক্তমবলে হারল ।

পাসব ইতি বিসি রাআ এতে সর মারল ।”

India Govt. MS., p. 3.

² “পিতৃসখা ভণি পিতৃরোজ সাহ সুরতান সমানল ।”

p. 4, H. P. Śāstri's edition.

know from history that Ibrāhim Shāh and Mahmūd were the 3rd and 4th independent rulers respectively of the kingdom of Jaunpur which came into being in 1394 A.D. owing to the weakness of the independent sovereign Mahmūd Tughlak. Ibrāhim ruled from 1401 to 1440 A.D. and his successor Mahmūd from 1440 to 1457.¹ If Kīrtilatā be found to be the earliest of Vidyāpati's works, its date may be roughly calculated to have been 1405-08 A.D., for Vidyāpati was engaged in other activities since 1410 A.D. under the family of Devasīmha.

Bhū-parikramā (ভূ-পরিক্রমা) is a work giving the geographical account of 65 towns or villages together with their purāṇic importance if any. This account is in the form of a story told to Baladev during his travel to Janakdeś. This work was written by Vidyāpati under orders from king Devasīmha of Mithilā who was at that time staying in the Naimiṣa forest with his son Śiva Sīmha.² There are occasional references to historical events such as the story of Narasīmhadēv of Kārṇāṭ family (কর্ণাটকুল) serving Mahammad, the Yavaneśvar of Hastināpur (Delhi).³ This story and many others are given in the Puruṣaparīkṣā (পুরুষপরীক্ষা) as well. The date of the composition must be earlier than 1413 A.D., the year in which Devasīmha died.

Puruṣaparīkṣā (পুরুষপরীক্ষা) is another prose work in Sanskrit on moral and political tales intended for the instruction of children : it is of the type of the Pañcatantra (পঞ্চতন্ত্র), the well-known Sanskrit work for the instruction of children : but unlike the Pañcatantra it does not describe animals talking on various topics, all its characters being human beings, many of whom are historical

¹ Elphinstone's History of India, pp. 748-49, ed. 1916.

² ভূ-পরিক্রমা, Sanskrit College MS. No. VI, 79. fol. ৯ introductory verses :

দেবসিংহে নিদেশাচ্চ নৈমিষারণ্যবাসিনঃ ।

শিবসিংহস্ত পিতুঃ পুত্র পিঠে নিবাসিনঃ ॥ ১ ॥

পঞ্চবটদেশযুতাং পঞ্চবটিকথাবিতাং ।

চতুঃপাণ্ড-সমায়ুক্তামাহ বিজ্ঞাপতিঃ কবিঃ ॥ ২ ॥

³ *Ibid*, fol. 27a-b : পুরা হস্তিনাপুরনাম্নিনগরে মহম্মদনামা যবনেশ্বরো বজ্রব। অস্মিন্ভাসমুদ্রং ধরণীবল্লভং শাসতি তদ্রূপকর্ষাসহিষ্ণুঃ কাফররাজপুত্রমভিযোক্তুং সকলবলসহিত স্তত্রাজগাম।..... (fol. 28a) তচ্চ যবনরাজবচনং শ্রুত্বা কর্ণাটকুলসংভবো নরসিংহদেবনামা চৌহান-কুল-সংভবশ্চাৰ্চিক নামা চ রাজকুমারৌ প্রোচতুঃ।..... ॥

characters. Many stories of the previous work (ভূপরিক্রমা) have been repeated unaltered in this work, which was written under the orders of Śiva Siṃha, but the king was dead before the completion of the work. We do not know when Śiva Siṃha died. According to the Mithilā-darpaṇ which records the traditions of Mithilā without any discrimination, gives a long reign (1403-1445) to Śiva Siṃha, and a long account of the king's death in prison at Delhi. According to this story, Lakhimā Devī, the chief queen of Śiva Siṃha, waited for 12 years after Śiva Siṃha had been imprisoned, and then she performed the *Kuśa-dāha-Śrāddha* (কুশদাহশ্রাদ্ধ). Mr. Nagendranāth Gupta, the celebrated editor of Vidyāpati's *Padāvalī* in Bengal (and in Mithilā too), speaks of another tradition according to which Śiva Siṃha was king only for 3½ years, after which he was killed in battle with the Musalmans. Although according to this tradition, no information was available of the king after the battle, Mr. Gupta infers that he must have been killed. Vidyāpati however* gives testimony to Śiva Siṃha's victorious warfare against a *Gauḍa* king and a *Gazzana* (Ghazni?) king. He also states that Śiva Siṃha was dead before the *Puruṣaparīkṣā* was completed. As this work is not a big one, it is likely that it was finished within about a year. In the light of this it may be assumed that the tradition that assigns a rule of 3½ years to Śiva Siṃha is most probably correct. So we have reasons to believe that the work was finished in about the year 1417 A.D. when Śiva Siṃha had been dead.¹

¹ *Puruṣaparīkṣā*, Darbhanga edition by Chandra Jhā; introductory verse 3. নিদেশাশ্লিঃশব্দং সদসি শিবসিংহ-কিত্তিপতেঃ। কথানাং প্রস্তাবং বিরচয়তি বিদ্যাপতি-কবিঃ॥ *Ibid* colophon of 4th Chapter : ইতি শ্রীসমন্ত-প্রক্রিয়া-বিরাজমান রূপনারায়ণ মহারাজ শ্রীশিবসিংহ দেব-পাদানামাজয়া শ্রীবিদ্যাপতি-বিরচিতায়াং পুরুষ-পরীক্ষায়াং পুরুষার্ধ-পরিচয়োনাম চতুর্থঃ পরিচয়ঃ ॥

Bengali translation of the পু. প. (Baṅgavāsī edition), final colophon : “মহা-রাজাধিরাজ শ্রীশিবসিংহ দেব যুদ্ধেতে সকল শত্রু জয় করিয়া এবং সাংসারিক তাবৎ হুথ ভোগ করিয়া শ্রীমন্ মহাদেবের সাক্ষাৎকারে দেহত্যাগ করিয়া মুক্ত হইয়াছেন।”

পু. প. final verse (not translated in the Bengali version).

যো গোঁড়েশ্বর-গজনেশ্বর-রণ-কৌণীযু অকু। যশো
দিক-কান্তাচয়-কুন্তলেষু নয়তে কুন্দশ্রজামাশদম্।
তন্ত শ্রীশিবসিংহ-দেব-নৃপতে বিজয়প্রিয়তাজয়া
প্রস্থং প্রস্থিল-দণ্ড-নীতি-বিবয়ে বিদ্যাপতিবর্ণিতানোং।

Although the two works, Bhū-parikramā and Puruṣaparīkṣā were written in Sanskrit prose they do not make a display of poetical excellences according to the conventional rules of Sanskrit poetics in which Vidyāpati was so well versed. This cannot be due to their having been composed in the early life of the poet, for his Kirtilatā (কীর্তিলতা), which is said to have been an earlier work than these, is replete with very beautiful expressions worthy of the name of Vidyāpati, although it was written in the Maithilī Apabhraṃśa. The simplicity of language is therefore due to the fact that the books were intended for the instruction of children.

Kīrtipatākā (কীর্তিপতাকা) is an amatory poem written in the same Avahatṭha (অবহট্ট) language in which the Kirtilatā was written under orders from king Śiva Simha and perhaps in his youthful days. The date of composition may therefore be inferred to have been about the same time as that of the Kirtilatā (1405-08 A.D.).

Likhanāvalī (লিখনাবলী) is a Sanskrit work on the forms of letter-writing composed under the patronage of a Purāditya who was a Jāigirdār in North Mithilā and who is said to have slain Arjun Simha, a younger member of the royal family of Kāmeśvar, otherwise known as the *Oṇī Varṇa*.¹ This event must have taken place in or before L. S. 299 (1417-18 A.D.), a date mentioned repeatedly in the sample forms of letters given in the work.

Gaṅgā-Vākya-āvalī (গঙ্গাবাক্যাবলী) is a poem on the religious merits of worshipping the holy river, of visiting it, or of bathing in it. It is a compilation made from various works on Smṛti and Purāṇ; the authorship is attributed to the patron who is Viśvāsa Devī, queen of Padma Simha, younger brother and successor of Śiva Simha.² The following are some of the works quoted or referred to: (1) the Mahābhārat, (2) the Rāmāyaṇ, (3) Chandoga-parīśiṣṭa, (4) Maitrāyaṇīya-parīśiṣṭa, (5) Yogi

About Śiva Simha's defeating গৌড় and গজ্জন kings see verse 3 in the introduction to the Śambhu vākya-āvalī quoted in that connection.

¹ End verse of Likhanāvalī :—


সংগ্রামেহর্জুন-ভূপতিবিনিহতো বকৌ নৃপংসায়িত
স্তেনেয়ং লিখনাবলী নৃপ-পুরাদিত্যেন নির্দ্দাপিতা ॥ ১ ॥

² End verse :

কিরমিবকমালোক্য ত্রিবিজ্ঞাপতি-স্মরণা ।
গঙ্গাবাক্যাবলী দেব্যাঃশ্রমণৈঃবিমলীকৃত্য ॥

Yājñavalkya, and various Purāṇs and Smṛtis. It mentions for the first time that as Prayāg (or Allahabad) is known as the *Yuktaveṇī* (যুক্তবেণী), Saptagrām or Dakṣiṇ Prayāg is the *Muktaveṇī* (মুক্তবেণী)¹. Vidyāpati has in this particular case been followed by Vācaspati Miśra (তীর্থচিন্তামণি), Gaṇapati (গঙ্গাভক্তিতরঙ্গিনী), Raghunandan (প্রায়শ্চিত্ত-তত্ত্ব), and almost all subsequent Smṛti scholars on the subject. This work (গঙ্গাবাক্যাবলী) is quoted several times by Gaṇapati in his Gaṅgābhaktitarangīṇī which work belongs to the early decades of the 16th century A.D. The author of this work cannot therefore be identified as Vidyāpati's father who happened to bear the same name (Gaṇapati).

Sambhu-vākyaṇī (শম্ভু-বাক্যাবলী) or Śaiva-sarvasva-sār (শৈব-সর্বস্বসার) is another great work attributed to the same Viśvāsa Devī. It consists of 2507 verses, and is thus a vast treatise on the Śaiva form of worship. In the introductory verses we find the following genealogy of the kings of the family :—



Bhavasimha is said to have been a very powerful monarch noted for his gifts to the beggars and for having conquered and subdued many kings. His son Devasimha is said to have been a great conqueror and endowed with all the virtues and merits of a worthy monarch. He is also said to have dug a great pleasure-tank (ক্রীড়া-তড়াগ) at Sakkurī Śāsan, for which benevolent work he is the fit object

Colophon : ইতি সমস্ত অফ্রিয়া বিরাজমান দানদলিত কল্পলতাভিমান ভাবিত বহুমান শ্রীমদ বিষ্ণব দেবী বিরচিতা গঙ্গাবাক্যাবলী সমাপ্ত। শকাব্দা: ১৭২৯।—India Office MS. No. 819 A (10).

¹ Sanskrit College MS. II, 322. fol. 121b. and 122a ; ততো দক্ষিণ প্রয়াগন্ত গঙ্গাতোয়াবুনাগত। সান্নাৎ তত্রাক্ষরং পুণ্যং প্রয়াগ ইব নখতি ॥.....তমুক্তবেণী সপ্তগ্রাম ইতি প্রসিদ্ধিঃ ॥

² ভূপালাবলি মৌলি মণ্ডন মণি প্রচারিতাঙ্কি, স্বরা-

ভোজ শ্রীভবসিংহ ভূপতিরভূৎ সব ঐকিকল্পমঃ ॥ ১ ॥

of the reverence of all. His son Siva Simha is said to have been a great hero who had led victorious campaigns against the *Gaṇḍa* king and the *Gazzana* (Ghazni?) king each of whom came to war with many huge armies driving many huge elephants. His younger brother and successor was Padmasimha who is said to have been like Bhīm in the battle field, like the Desire-granting tree in liberality, like the great Himālay, the autumnal full moon, and the white lotus in fame: he had been made with the essence of all great beings by the Creator; e.g., with the learning of Brhaspati, the humility of Rām, the valour of the god of Death, the patience of the Earth, the gravity of the Sea, and the liberality of Vali. His queen Viśvāsa Devī was born in the world-famous family like Lakṣmī in the Milk Ocean, and had herself attained the height of virtuous deeds. Seated on the throne of her husband she maintained the whole of the land of Mithilā and was like Arundhatī herself in character. Like Śacī of Indra, like Gaurī of the lord of Gaurī, like Ratī of Kām, like Sītā of Rām, like Śrī of Viṣṇu was the great queen of Padmasimha, bright with intelligence, affable in manners, known in the world for political craft, and wakeful in


দৃপ্যদ্বৈবৈরি বিপদজনাকণ্ড কঞ্জীরবজ্রী
 রাসীমাশেষ ভূভূমি মুকুট তট জ্যোতির্জ্যোতিতাজিঃ ।
 তৎ সূক্ষ্মঃ পুণ্যকীর্তি নর্য বিনয় দয়া দান দাক্ষিণ্যদক্ষো
 বৃক্ষঃ সব শ্রিতান্যং মিথিলভূবি নৃপো দেবসিংহো বভূব ॥ ২ ॥
 দত্তং যেন বিজ্ঞেভ্যো দ্বিরদরথ মহাদানমষ্টৈরশক্যং
 কা বাতী ভস্ম দানে কনকময়ভূলা পুরুষো যেন দত্তঃ ।
 যন্ত ক্রীড়াভাঙ্গলয়তি স [কুরী] শাসনে বারিরাশিঃ
 দেবোহসৌ দেবসিংহঃ ক্ষিতিপতিতিলকঃ কন্ত ন স্তারমন্তঃ ॥ ৩ ॥
 ক্ষৌণ্ডিত্ত্ব রমুয্য বৈরি বনিতা বৈদক্ষ্য দীক্ষাশুভ্রে
 রুদ্রভূতঃ শিবসিংহদেবনৃপতি বীর্যবতঃসঃ হতঃ ॥
 শৌর্যাবজ্জিত গোড় গজ্জন মহীপালোপনত্রীকৃত-
 নেকোত্তম মতঙ্গজাখকনকচ্ছত্রাভিরামোদয়ঃ ॥ ৪ ॥
 সংগ্রামাঙ্গণ সীম ভীম সদৃশ স্তস্তামুজ []
 দান স্বল্পিত কল্পবৃক্ষমহিমাহসৌ পদ্মসিংহো নৃপঃ ।
 কৈলাসোদর সোদরীরতি, শরদ্রাকা শশাকীরতি,
 প্রালেয়াচল শেখরীরতি, যশো যন্তারবিন্দীরতি ॥ ৫ ॥

the whole world. She was the daughter of a great Brāhmaṇ and favourite queen of the king. How many men have been famed in the world for liberality ! and how many there are ! But none of them can equal the queen Viśvāsa Devī in liberal habits. The Viśvabhāg tank with the flower gardens on its embankments with numberless bees humming thereon proclaims the name of Viśvāsa Devī (who is fancifully likened to the tank itself in graces). Viśvāsa Devī was also accustomed to daily celebrating the worship of Śiv with innumerable gifts to the poor. It was this world-famous queen Viśvāsa Devī who ordered the great poet Vidyāpati to compile the encyclopædic holy scripture of the Śaiva cult. This *Śambhu-vākya-āvalī* (শম্ভু-বাক্যাবলী) is to be the shelter of learned men wishing to attain *siddhi* (salvation) like a Wishgranting creeper spreading with new foliage, new flowers and charming fruits.

* * * *

বিদ্যামঙ্গিরসঃ স্ততস্ত, বিনয়ঃ রামস্ত, বৃত্তং মুনঃ,
 শৌৰ্যং সূৰ্যস্ততস্ত, ধৈর্যমবনেন্, গান্ধীযমশ্চোনিধেঃ ।
 দানং দানবনন্দনস্ত, সকলং সারং সমু[দ্ধি]স্ত ।
 ধাত্রা যঃ শরদিন্দু সুল্লর যশাঃ ক্ষৌণিপতি নিমিত্তঃ ॥ ৬ ॥
 দুষ্কাজ্জোধেরিবশ্রী গুণগণ সদৃশে বিশ্ববিখ্যাতবংশে
 সম্ভূতা পদ্মসিংহ ক্ষিতিপতি দয়িতা ধর্মকর্মকসীমা ।
 পত্ন্যাঃ সিংহাসনস্থা পৃথু মিথিলমহী মণ্ডলং পালয়ন্তী
 শ্রীমদ্ বিশ্বাস দেবী জগতি বিজয়তে চর্যরাহরক্ষতীব ॥ ৭ ॥
 ইন্দ্রস্তেব শচী সমুজ্জলগুণা গৌরীব গৌরীপতে:
 কামস্তেব রতিঃ স্বভাবমধুরা সীতেব রামস্ত যা ।
 বিষ্ণোঃ শ্রীরিব পদ্মসিংহ নৃপতে রেধা পরা প্রেমসী
 বিশ্বখ্যাতনয়া দ্বিজেন্দ্র-তনয়া জাগর্তি ভূমণ্ডলে ॥ ৮ ॥
 দাতারঃ কতি নাহভবন্ কতি ন বা সন্তীহ ভূমণ্ডলে
 নৈকোহপি অধিতঃ প্রদান যশসো বিশ্বাস দেব্যাঃ সমঃ ।
 যন্তাঃ স্বর্ণতুলা মুখাখিল মহাদান প্রদানা []
 স্বর্ণ [] মৃগীদৃশামপি তুল্যকোটি ধনিঃ অন্নতে ॥ ৯ ॥
 লীলা লোলা বনালী [] চ নিচয় দলদ্ বীচি বিস্তারভার
 অব্যক্তোন্মুক্তমুক্তা তরল তর তর চন্দ্র সন্দোহবাহুঃ ।
 পুষ্পাং পুষ্পোদমালাকুল কলিত লসদ্ ভৃঙ্গ সঙ্গীত সঙ্গী
 শ্রীমদ্ বিশ্বাস দেব্যা সমরচিরুচিতো বিশ্বভাগশুভাগঃ ॥ ১০ ॥

Vibhāgasār (বিভাগসার) is another work of about 585 verses on the law of partition of property and inheritance. This was composed by Vidyāpati at the instance of Narasimhadev, son of Harisimha dev, son of Bhavasiṃhadev. Narasimha was also known by the *Virud Darpanārāyaṇ*.¹ The following table gives the full genealogy :—



নিত্যং দেব বিজ্ঞার্থং সবিণ বিতরণারম্ভ সম্ভাবিত হ্রীং
 ধমজ্ঞা চন্দ্রচূড় প্রতিদিবস-সমারাদনৈকাগ্র চিত্তা ।
 বিজ্ঞানুজ্ঞাপ্য বিদ্যাপতি কৃতিনমসৌ বিশ্ববিখ্যাতকীর্তিঃ ।
 হ্রীমদ্ বিশ্বাস দেবী বিরচয়তি শিবং শৈবসকলস্বসারম্ ॥ ১১ ॥

প্রমাণমূল্য নব পল্লবাঢ্যা
 সপুষ্পিকা রম্যা ফলোপপন্না ।
 অভীষ্টসিদ্ধৌ বিবুধৈরুপেয়া
 বাক্যাবলী কল্পতেব শ্লোকাঃ ॥ ১২ ॥

The title of the work is most probably শতুবাক্যাবলী as given in the 12th verse and not শৈবসকলস্বসার as given in the 11th. Compare the titles প্রজ্ঞাবাক্যাবলী and দানবাক্যাবলী. The work is compared to a wish-granting creeper in the last verse and gives the name of the work as শ্লোকাবাক্যাবলী ।

¹ “রাজো ভবেশাদ্ হরিসিংহ আসীৎ

তৎসুহৃদা দর্পনারায়ণেন ।

Dānavākyaśālī (দানবাক্যাবলী) is a poetical work on the religious merits of various kinds of gifts. The work is attributed to *Dhīravatī*, the elder queen of *Narasimhadev*.¹ A manuscript of this work dated 1539 *saṁvat* (1482 A.D.) is reported in *Bhandarkar's Report* for the year 1883-84, p. 352.

Durgābhaktitaranginī (দুর্গাভক্তিতরঙ্গিনী) is a huge work of over one thousand verses and is the latest of *Vidyāpati's* Sanskrit works. It was written under the patronage of the three brothers, *Dhīrasimha*, *Bhairavasimha* and *Candrasimha*, the three sons of *Narasimha*.² The ceremony of the autumnal worship of the goddess, *Durgā*, has

রাজ্ঞা নিযুক্তোহত্র বিভাগসারং

বিচার্য বিদ্যাপতিরান্নোতি ॥ ২ ॥

অথ বিভাগঃ ।

বিভাগোহর্থস্ত পিতৃত্য পূর্বৈষত্র একল্লভ্যতে ।

দায়ভাগ ইতি শ্রোক্তং তদ্বিবাদ পদং বুধৈঃ ॥

পূর্বস্মিন্ সম্বন্ধাদেব নিমিত্তাদ্ যত্র স্বয়ং স দায়ঃ ।”

Introductory verses, *Vibhāgasār*.

¹ বিজ্ঞানভূষণ্য বিদ্যাপতি মতিকৃতিনং সশ্রমাণামুদারাম্ ।

রাজ্ঞী পুণ্যাবলোকা বিরচয়তি নবাং দানবাক্যাবলীং সা ॥ ৬ ॥

Introductory verses.

² India Government MS. No. 4760, fol. ল, introductory verse 5 ;

শৌৰ্ধাবজিত পঞ্চগৌড় ধরগীনাথোপনম্রীকৃত।

হনেকোত্তম তুরঙ্গ সজত সিতচ্ছত্রাভিরামোদয়ঃ ।

শ্রীমদ্ ভৈরবসিংহ দেব নৃপতির্ধন্যাত্মজম্বাজয়

ত্যাচন্দ্রার্কমণ্ড কীর্তি সহিতঃ শ্রীরূপনারায়ণঃ ॥ ৫ ॥

Ibid fol. 99a, end verses and colophon :

যন্ত ক্ষীরসমুদ্রযশসো রামন্ত সৌমিত্রিবৎ

ক্ষৌণীমণ্ডল মণ্ডনো বিজয়তে শ্রীচন্দ্রসিংহোহম্বজঃ ॥ ৩ ॥

যাবদ্ দুর্গা (গঙ্গা ?) তরঙ্গ স্বরয়তি জটামণ্ডলং চন্দ্রমৌলেশু

অর্দ্ধাঙ্গে যাবচ্ছৈলন্ত নিবসতি দৃঢ়প্রেমবন্ধা ভবানী ।

সমীমালানুকারে শিরসি শশিকলা যাবদেতন্ত তাবৎ

কীর্তিঃ শ্রীধীরসিংহ ক্ষিতিপতি তিলকশ্চৈরমুখীং চকাস্ত ॥ ৪ ॥

ইতি সমস্ত এক্সিয়া বিরাজমান মানদলিত ত্রিপুরাজাধিরাজ শিবভক্তিপরায়ণ শ্রীদর্পনারায়ণ দেবান্দ্র সমস্ত এক্সিয়ালঙ্কৃত নৃপতিবর বী (ধী) র সিংহ দেবানাং সমরবিজয়িনাং কৃতৌ শ্রীদুর্গাভক্তিতরঙ্গিনী পরিপূর্ণা ॥

been a great festival in Eastern India for the last thousand years. Śūlapāṇi of the court of the Sen kings of Bengal wrote a work on the subject called 'Durgotsavaviveka' (দুর্গোৎসব-বিবেক) in the 12th century A.D. But Vidyāpati's work is much greater in importance and much larger in size. All subsequent writers on the subject have had to refer to him and quote him as an important authority. We do not know the exact date of the composition of this great work, but we have an authentic date of the reign of Dhīrasimha. A copy of Śrīnivāsa's commentary on the Prākṛta poem Setubandha, called the Setu-darpaṇī (সেতুদর্পণী) was copied by one Ratneśvar in 321 L. S., Kārtik new moon, Saturday (1440 A.D.) when Dhīrasimha was the ruling King in Mithilā.¹ But the late Mr. Manomohan Cakravartī ascertained by astronomical calculations that the Kārtik new moon fell on a Saturday in the year 1438 (18th October) and not in the year 1440. Mr. Nagendra-nāth Gupta thinks that Vidyāpati died in about the year 329 L.S. Kārtik, 13th day of the bright moon (p. ৯০ of the introduction). This corresponds to 1448 A.D. We may therefore reasonably suppose that Durgābhaktitarangīṇī was finished some time before 1448 A.D.

Two works of Vidyāpati have been lost to us ;—(1) *Varṣakṛtya* (বর্ষকৃত্য), a work on the Hindu ceremonies and festivals throughout the year, and (2) *Gayāvākya-āvalī* (গয়াবাক্যাবলী), a work on the merits of giving *piṇḍa* to the manes at Gayā. *Varṣakṛtya* has been quoted by Raghunandan in his *Malamāsa-tattva*, but the other work rests absolutely on tradition.

From a study of the works of Vidyāpati we may come to the clear conclusion that his literary activities extend from about 1405 A.D. to about 1448 A.D. No work of Vidyāpati is known to us that is dated either before 1405 or after 1448 A.D.

Sir George Abraham Grierson collected from local sources a genealogy of the family of Vidyāpati which he published in his *Maithil Chrestomathy* in the year 1881 A.D. (p. 39), (a similar list had

¹ Śrīnivāsa's Setu-darpaṇī, colophon :

পরম ভট্টারকেত্যানি মহারাজাধিরাজ শ্রীমদ্ লক্ষণসেন দেবীরৈকবংশতাত্ত্বিক শত ত্রয়তমাদে
কার্তিকমাবস্থায়ঃ শনৌ সমস্ত প্রজিহ্না বিরাজমান রিপুর্জ কংসনারায়ণ শিবভক্তিপরায়ণ
মহারাজাধিরাজ শ্রীশ্রীমদ্ ধীরসিংহ সংভূজ্যমানায়ঃ তীরভূজৌ অলাপুতপা প্রতিবন্ধ (ক) স্থলরী
গ্রামে বসতা সদ্ধপাধ্যায় শ্রীহৃদ্যাকরণামাজ্জেন ছাত্র শ্রীরত্নেশ্বরেণ স্বার্থং পরার্থং চ লিখিতমিদং
সেতুদর্পণীপুস্তকমিতি ।

been published by Rājkr̥ṣṇa Mukhopādhyāy in the Bangadarśan, a few years ago). For convenience of reference we give the list below :

8. Viṣṇunāth Śarmā Ṭhākur ; of Bisphi, the founder.
7. Harāditya Ṭhākur
6. Karmāditya Ṭhākur ('Dharmāditya' acc. to Rājkr̥ṣṇa Mukherjee).
5. Devāditya Ṭhākur
4. Dhīreśvar Ṭhākur ('Bīreśvar' acc. to Rājkr̥ṣṇa Mukherjee).
3. Jayadatta Ṭhākur
2. Gaṇapati Ṭhākur
1. Vidyāpati Ṭhākur
2. Harapati Ṭhākur
3. None, *alias* Ratidhar Ṭhākur
4. Raghu Ṭhākur
5. Viśvanāth Ṭhākur
6. Pītāmbhar Ṭhākur
7. Nārāyaṇ Ṭhākur
8. Dinamaṇi Ṭhākur
9. Tulā Ṭhākur
10. Ekanāth Ṭhākur
11. Bhāijā Ṭhākur

112. Nanū Ṭhākur

12. Phanilāl Ṭhākur

13. Banamālī Ṭhākur

113. Badrināth Ṭhākur

This table which gives nothing but mere names of twenty generations of Vidyāpati's family has been a source of confusion to all subsequent scholars who tried to identify some of these names with names of great men living at different times in Mithilā. Mr. Nagendranāth Gupta asserts with a certain amount of firmness that the author of the Gaṅgābhaktitaranginī (গঙ্গাভক্তিতরঙ্গিনী) must be identified with Gaṇapati who happens to be in the above table as the father of Vidyāpati. He also asserts that this Gaṇapati was the court paṇḍit of Rājā Gaṇeśvar, uncle of Śiva Simha ; but he gives no evidence in support of his statements. We have already seen from the evidence of Vidyāpati's Kīrtilātā that the name of

¹ Alive in 1881 A.D.

Śivasimha's uncle was not Gaṇeśvar, but *Gaṇeśa* or *Gaana Rāya*¹ which cannot be the phonetic equivalents of *Gaṇeśvar* in Maithili Apabhraṁśa in which the work is written. Moreover we have already seen in our description of Vidyāpati's *Gaṅgāvākya* that the author of the *Gaṅgābhaktitaranṅinī* quotes passages from the *Gaṅgāvākya* and refers to him as a professor of great respect. The late Mr. Manomohan Chakravarti places Gaṇapati in the early decades of the 16th century A.D. There are two manuscripts of *Gaṅgābhaktitaranṅinī* in the Calcutta Sanskrit College Library. A reference was made to these two manuscripts which disclosed the fact that the small work of Gaṇapati (*in 3 taranṅas*) quotes Vidyāpati on three occasions as authority. Therefore we are unable to identify Vidyāpati's father as the author of the *Gaṅgābhaktitaranṅinī* who belongs to a much later age.

Another attempt has been made to connect the family of Vidyāpati with that of Caṇḍeśvar on account of the fact that 'Devāditya' is a name common to the two families. Karmāditya who gave the temple of Tilakeśvar in 1332 A.D. cannot be the great grand father of Caṇḍeśvar who made a gift of his own weight in gold in 1314 A.D. and was at that time a very powerful minister. We have therefore no grounds upon which to base the identity of the two families.² It may be correct to speak of Karmāditya as an ancestor of Vidyāpati and not of Caṇḍeśvar. In the light of this fact we can approximate the time in which Vidyāpati might have been born. Allowing that Karmāditya was

¹ 'রায়গুৰু' কিত্তিসিংহ গঞেসহুঅ p. 4, Kirtilātā ed. H. P. Śāstrī.

তাহু তনঅ নঅবিনঅ নঅগরুঅ রাএ গঞেস p. 5, *ibid.*

পাস বইসি বিসবাসি রাএ গঞেসর মায়ল p. 7, *ibid.*

পাতিসাহ উদ্দেশে চলু গঅনরাঅকো পুস্ত p. 9, *ibid.*

অরু লোঅন্তর দগ্গ গউ গঅগরাএ ময়ু বাপ p. 20, *ibid.*

গঞরাএ তো বখিঅ তো নসের বিহার চাপিঅ p. 21, *ibid.*

These names may phonetically correspond to গগনেশ, গগনেশ্বর and গগন রায় and not to গণেশ or গণেশ্বর.

² Date on a stone inscription in the temple of Tilakeśvar which Mr. Gupta thinks to be the date of the construction of the temple :

“অকে শশাঙ্ক পক্ষ নেত্র গহিতে শ্রীলক্ষ্মণ স্থাপতেঃ”

an old man of 60 when the temple was constructed in 1332 A.D., we may suppose that three of his descendants, Devāditya, Dhīreśvar and Jayadatta had been born by that time. Jayadatta's son Gaṇapati cannot be thought of as born before about 1352 A.D., and so *Vidyāpati cannot be thought of as born before about 1372 A.D.* But all this is merely a surmise verging on one extremity of possibilities.

We have got two authentic dates in the life of Vidyāpati :— (1) L. S. 291 corresponding to 1410 A.D. when a copy of the *Kāvya-prakāśavivēka* was copied under his order : and (2) L. S. 309 corresponding to 1428 A.D., when Vidyāpati himself copied the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.¹ We have no other authentic dates earlier than these dates. Therefore we would not be far removed from truth if we suppose that *Vidyāpati was born in about 1372 A.D. and died in about 1448 A.D.* But we have positive evidences to believe that Vidyāpati was alive from 1400 A.D. to 1438 A.D.

Paṇḍit Vinod Vihārī Kāvya-tīrtha has discovered a song which gives the date in which Devasīmha died. The song which has been accepted by Mr. Gupta without acknowledgment gives both the

This gives the year 213 L. S. which corresponds to 1332 A.D.—p. 16/.

Caṇḍeśvar's Tulāpuruṣa gift :—

রসগুণভূজচন্দ্রৈঃ সন্নিতে শাকবর্ষে
সহসি ধবল পক্ষে বাগবতী সিক্তীরে ।
অদ্বিত তুলিতমুচ্চৈরাঙ্গনা সর্গরাশিঃ
নিধিরখিল গুণানামুত্তমঃ সামনাথঃ ॥

This gives the Śaka year 1236 which corresponds to 1314 A.D.

¹ India Government MS. fol. 117a ; ইতি তর্কচাৰ্ণ ঠক্কর শ্রীশ্রীধর বিরচিতো কাব্য-
একাশবিলেকে দশম উল্লাসঃ ॥ শুভমস্ত ॥ সমস্ত বিরদাবলী বিরাজমান মহারাজাধিরাজ শ্রীমৎ
শিবসিংহ দেব সংভূজ্যমান তীর ভূক্তৌ শ্রীগজরথপূরনগরে সম্রাট্ট সন্ন্যাসাধার ঠক্কর শ্রীবিজ্ঞাপতী-
নামাঙ্করা গোয়া ল সং শ্রীদেবশর্মা বলিয়াস সং শ্রীঅভাকরাত্যাং লিখিতৈবা হস্তাভ্যাং । ল সং ২৯১
কার্ত্তিক বদি ১০ ॥

It appears from this that the father Devasīmha and the son Śivasīmha were joint rulers of Mithilā in 291 L. S. (1410 A.D.).

Bhāgavatapurāṇa copied by Vidyāpati himself :—

শুভমস্ত সর্বার্গগতা সংখ্যা ল সং ৩০৯ শ্রাবণ শুদি ১৫ কুজে রজা বনৌলি গ্রামে শ্রীবিজ্ঞাপতে-
লিপিরিহমিতি ॥ Gupta p. 17/.

Lakṣmaṇ era and the Śaka era, but unfortunately these two dates do not tally. L. S. 293 corresponds to 1413 A.D., whereas Śaka 1324 corresponds to 1403 A.D. Mr. Manomohan Chakravarti ascertained by astronomical calculations that Caitra vadi 6 fell on a Thursday in 1413 A.D. (on March 23rd) which is equivalent to 1334 Śaka and L. S. 293 (expired). He suggests therefore that the Śaka year should be corrected to 1334. This inaccuracy is perhaps due to a misreading (কর for পুর).¹

The real date of the copper-plate grant of Mahārāj Śivasimha Dev to Vidyāpati is L. S. 293 which corresponds to 1412 A.D. On the strength of the grant Vidyāpati's descendants were in possession of the village of Bisphī free of rent up to about 1350 A.D., when there was a settlement of land disputes instituted by the British Government in the district of Darbhanga. The original copper-plate grant having been lost, a copy was manufactured by the owners of the village which gave three other dates in addition to the original date in Lakṣmaṇ Saṁvat : viz., "San 807, Saṁvat 1455, Śaka 1321." The fasli San date, which was founded by Akbar about 170 years later, was given in the manufactured copper-plate grant by the carelessness of those who manufactured it. Moreover there was a discrepancy regarding these dates themselves : viz., the L. S. date corresponded to 1412 A.D., whereas the other dates corresponded to 1399 A.D. and 1400 A.D. In consequence of this the descendants of Vidyāpati had to give up the possession of the village rent-free. It would therefore be wrong to suppose that the date of the original grant is wrong on the ground that in the forged grant there was a discrepancy of dates.

¹ Gupta (1316 B. S.) p. 531, and Sāhitya Pariṣat Patra 1307 B.S. p. 30 by Vinod Vihārī Kāvyaśīrṣa :

অনল রক্ত কর লক্ষণ নরবৎ
সক সমুদ্রকর (পুর প) অগ্নিনি সসী ।
চৈতকারি ছঠি জেঠা মিলিঅও
বার বেহঙ্গএ জাউ লসী ॥

So we come to another authentic date 1412 A.D. in the life of Vidyāpati. ¹

Now let us turn to the songs of Vidyāpati which is our subject. We have already seen that Vidyāpati was a vastly learned Sanskrit scholar, and that a copy of a commentary on the Kāvyaaprakāśa was made for him under his order. In consequence of this he was thoroughly conversant with the conventions of Sanskrit rhetorics, and all his excellence in poetical art comes of his acquaintance with these conventions. Whatever he wrote, he ornamented with figures of speech, and *utprekṣā* (উৎপ্রেক্ষা) is his favourite rhetoric. It is in this particular that he differs from Caṇḍīdās and the other padāvalī poets of Bengal who are poets of feeling and not of rhetoric. Let us take a few examples in order to appreciate properly this standard in Vidyāpati.

এ পনি কমলিনি শুন হিতবাণী ।
 প্রেম করবি অব সুপুরুষ জানি ॥
 সজ্জনক প্রেম হেম সমতুল ।
 দাহিতে কনক ঝিঙাণ হয় মূল ॥

¹ In B. S. P. P. 1307 B. S., Vinod Vihārī Kāvya-tīrtha quotes the text of the grant :

স্বস্তি শ্রীগজরথোতাদি সমস্ত প্রক্রিয়া বিরাজমান শ্রীমদ্রামেশ্বরী বরলক্ষ প্রসাদ ভবানী ভবভক্তি ভাবনাপরায়ণ রূপনারায়ণ মহারাজাধিরাজ শ্রীমৎ শিবসিংহ দেব পাদাঃ সমরবিজয়িনঃ । জরইল তপ্পায়া বিদগ্ধীগ্রামবাস্তব্য সকল লোকান্ ভূকর্ষকাংশ সমাদিশস্তি মতমন্ত । ভবতাং গ্রামোহয়মস্মাভিঃ স প্রক্রিয়াস্তিনব জয়দেব মহারাজ পণ্ডিত ঠাকুর শ্রীবিদ্যাপতিভ্যঃ শাসনীকৃত্য প্রদত্তোহতো বৃষ্মতেভ্যঃ বচনকরীভূয় কর্ষাদিকং কৰ্ম্ম করিষ্যথেতি । ল সং ২৯৩ আৰণ শুদি সপ্তম্যাং গুরো । শ্লোকান্ত ।

অক্কে লক্ষ্মণ সেন ভূপতি মতে বহি ৩-গ্রহ ৭-ষ্যঙ্কিতে ২
 মাসি আৰণ সংজকে মূনিতিথৌ পক্ষে২ বলক্ষে গুরো
 বাগ্‌বত্যাঃ সরিতন্তটে গজরথোতাত্যা প্রসিদ্ধে পুরে
 দিৎসোৎসাহবিবুদ্ধবাহ পুলকঃ সন্ত্যায় মধ্যেসম্ভম ॥

* * * *

গ্রামে গুরুভ্যম্মিন্ কিমপি নুপতরো হিন্দবোহস্তেতুরকা
 গো কোলপাশ্চমাৎসৈসহিতমমুদিনং ভূঞ্জতে তে স্বধৰ্ম্ম ॥

সন ৮০৭ সংবৎ ১৪৫৫ শাকে ১৩২১ ॥

টুটইতে নাহি টুটে প্রেম অদভুত ।
 জেছনে বাঢ়ত মুণালক সূত ॥
 সবহঁ মতজজে মোতি নাহি জানি ।
 সকল কণ্ঠে নাহি কোয়িল বাণী ॥
 সকল সময় নহে ঋতু বসন্ত ।
 সকল পুরুষ নারি নহে গুণবন্ত ॥
 ভগয়ে বিছাপতি গুন বরনারি ।
 প্রেমক রীতি অব বুঝি বিচারি ॥

This song which makes a display of learnedness is a typical song of the Maithil bard and can serve as a standard in our study of his other songs. This song appears in the anthologies of Bengal, such as the *Padakalpataru*, the *Padāmṛtasamudra* and the *Padaratnākar*, but in none of the anthologies of Mithilā. Mr. Gupta has slightly altered the text in his own way.

বাণী রমণী রমণে নাহি সুখ ।
 অন্তরে মদন দিগুণ দেই ছুখ ॥
 সুখ নাহি পাওল বেদন সার ।
 গরুঅ ভুখে জনি খোর আহার ॥
 সব সখি মেলি গুতায়ল পাশ ।
 চমকি চমকি ধনি ছাড়এ নিশাস ॥
 করইতে কোর মোড়ই সব অঙ্গ ।
 যজ্ঞ না গুনয়ে জনি বাল ভুজঙ্গ ॥
 বেরি এক করে ধনি মুদিত নয়ান ।
 রোগি করয়ে জমু ঔখদ পান ॥
 তিল আধ দুখ জনম ভরি সুখ ।
 ইথে কাহে ধনি তুহঁ মোড়সি মুখ ॥
 ভগয়ে বিছাপতি গুনহ মুরারি ।
 তুহু রসসাগর মুণ্ডধিনি নারি ॥

This song also appears in the anthologies of Bengal, such as the *Padakalpataru*, but in none of Mithilā. It also makes a display of his poetical skill and not his skill in stirring the feeling of hearers.

We give below five songs on the same subject : the description of a bathing damsel : in all of these there is a display of Vidyāpati's poetical powers.

কামিনি করএ সনানে ।
 হেরিত হি হৃদঅ হনল পচঁমানে ॥
 চিকুর গরএ জলধারা ।
 জনি মুখসসি ডরে রোঅএ অঙ্কারা ॥
 কুচজুগ চারু চকেবা ।
 নিঅকুল (নদীকুল ?) মিলত আনি কোনে দেবা ॥
 [নিজকুলে (নদীকুলে ?) আনি মিলায়ল কোনে দেবা ॥
 পাঠান্তর]
 তেঁ সকাঞে ভুজপাসে ।
 বাধি ধএল উড়ি জাএত অকাসে ॥
 তিতল বসন তহু লাগু ।
 মুনিহক মানস মনমথ জাগু ॥
 ভনই বিছাপতি গাবে ।
 গুণমতি ধনি পুনমত জনি পাবে ॥

আজু মঝু শুভদিন ভেলা ।
 কামিনি পেখল সনানক বেলা ॥
 চিকুর গরয় জলধারা ।
 মেহ বরিস জনি মোতিমহারা ॥
 বদন পোছল পরচুরে ।
 মাজি ধয়ল জনি কনকমুকুরে ॥
 তেঁই উদসল কুচ জোরা ।
 পলটি বৈসাওল কনক কটোরা ॥
 নৌবিবন্ধ করল উদেস ।
 বিছাপতি কহ মনোরথ শেষ ॥

জাইত পেখল নহাইলি গোরী ।
 কতিসঞে রূপ ধনি আনলি চোরী ॥
 কেশ নিদ্রাহিতে বহ জলধারা ।
 চামরে গলয় জনি মোতিম হারা ॥
 অলকহি তীতল তহি অতি শোভা ।
 অলিফুল কমলে বেড়ল মনোলোভা ॥
 নীরে নিরঞ্জন লোচন রাতা ।
 সিন্দূরে মণ্ডিত জনি পঙ্কজ পাতা ॥
 সজ্জল চীর রহ পয়োধর সীমা ।
 কনক বেল জনি পড়ি গেল হীমা ॥
 ও মুকি করতহি চাহে কিয় দেহা ।
 অবহি ছোড়ব মোহি তেজব নেহা ॥
 ঐসন রস নাহি পাওব আরা ।
 ইথে লাগি রোই গলয় জলধারা ॥
 বিছাপতি কহ শুনহ মুরারী ।
 বসনে লাগল ভাব রূপ নেহারী ॥

নহাই উঠল তীরে রাই কমলমুখি
 সমুখে হেরল বরকান ।
 গুরুজন সঙ্গে লাজে ধনি নত মুখি
 কৈসনে হেরব বয়ান ॥
 সুখি হে অপুরুব চাতুরি গোরি ।
 সবজন তেজি আশুসরি সঞ্চরি
 আড় বদন তহি ফেরি ॥
 তহি পুন মোতিহার টুটি ফেকল
 কহইত হার টুটি গেল ।
 সবজন এক এক চুনি সঞ্চর
 সাম দরস ধনি লেল ॥

নয়ন চকোর কাছুক মুখ সসিবর
 করল অমিয় রস পান ।
 হুহু হুহু দরশনে রসহ পসারল
 কবি বিজ্ঞাপতি ভান ॥

নাহি উঠল তীরে সে ধনি রাহি ।
 মঝু মুখ স্নন্দরি অবনত চাহি ॥
 এ সখি পেখল অপূর্ব গোরি ।
 বল করি চীত চোরায়ল মোরি ॥
 একলি চললি ধনি হোই অশুয়ান ।
 উমগি কহই সখি করহ পয়ান ॥
 কিরে ধনি রাগি বিরাগিনি হোয় ।
 আশ নিরাশ দগধ-তম্বু মোয় ॥
 কৈসে মিলব হমে সে ধনি অবলা ।
 চীত নয়ন মঝু হুহু তাহে রহলা ॥
 বিজ্ঞাপতি কহ শুনহ মুরারি ।
 ধৈরজ ধরহ মিলব বরনারি ॥

These are five songs on the same sentiment—the description of a bathing damsel. There are many repetitions of the same thought simply for the display of poetical imagery which have nothing to do with the feeling of a hearer. Let us take an example. The poet says that water trickles down her hair ; but he cannot be satisfied with making a bare statement of facts and hence he takes recourse to his learned skill and on three occasions he calls up three different images. On the first occasion the poet compares the face to the moon and the dishevelled hair to darkness. According to a poetical convention Darkness is always afraid of the sun and the moon. The poet refers to this convention and says that drops of tear come down from the eyes of Darkness (hair) who is afraid of the moon (the damsel's face). This one

picture does not satisfy the poet who is eager to make a display of his learned imagination. Therefore he calls up another image in the mind of the hearer. Here the drops of water are likened to beads of pearl, and the damsel's hair to a cloud, and says that a cloud (hair) rains down beads of pearl (drops of water): The next is a picture of beads of pearl dropping down from a *cāmar* or *shawrie* set with pearls.¹ Thus we see that our poet is a poet of imaginations and not a poet of sentiments.

We shall next enter into a discussion about the genuineness of some of the songs that are ascribed to Vidyāpati. In the first place let us note the gradual increase in the number of songs ascribed to this poet. Akṣay Chandra Sarkār published one hundred and sixty-four of Vidyāpati's songs and ninety songs with the *bhaṇitās* of Kavirañjan, Rāy Basanta, Campatipati, Bhūpati, Simha Bhūpati, Bhūpatināth and others. These latter songs were not included in the collection ascribed to Vidyāpati, but given in the same volume as an appendix (*বিজ্ঞাপতির পরিশিষ্ট*). But Mr. Nagendranāth Gupta has brought to light a collection of nine hundred and thirty-five songs all of which he ascribes to Vidyāpati. We have therefore to examine the genuineness of the songs that are ascribed to Vidyāpati, before we are in a position to make a fair estimate of the poet as he is represented in his songs.

First of all let us try to make a fair estimate of the sources of Mr. Gupta's songs. Mr. Gupta speaks very highly of his palm leaf manuscript (*তালপত্রের পুঁথি*), which he considers to be an authority on the songs of Vidyāpati, because, he says, it was found together with the manuscript of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇam* copied by the poet himself. He speaks of a tradition which ascribes the hand-writing to Vidyāpati's great grandson. He considers the manuscript (which is incomplete and un-dated) to be 300 years old. The manuscript would, according to him, put an end to all imaginary views regarding the songs of Vidyāpati.¹

¹ বিজ্ঞাপতির পদাবলী সম্বন্ধে এই পুঁথিখানি বিশিষ্ট প্রমাণ। কবির স্বহস্তলিখিত ভাগবত গ্রন্থ ও এই পুঁথি স্রাবর একত্র রক্ষিত ছিল। * * * । ৩০০ বৎসর পূর্বের লিখিত অমূল্য কবিতা অক্ষত হয় না। * * * । পুঁথি লিখিবার তালপত্র দুই রকমের, এক পক্ষে অনেক দিন পুঁথি রাখিয়া প্রস্তুত করা, আর এক সাধারণ পত্র। প্রথম শ্রেণীর পত্রগুলি উত্তম, মন্থ,

In spite of these high praises of the manuscript we are for various reasons unable to consider it to be a reliable compilation. The language of the songs in this collection is corrupt in many places, the metre is sometimes so affected that it is, difficult to identify the corruption with the original, and there are many other irregularities which we will not notice, in this article for the sake of brevity. But we must note the inclusion in this collection of songs composed by other poets than Vidyāpati. Mr. Gupta's song No. 366 (p. 223) is a song taken from Umāpati's Pārijātaḥaraṇ and included in the palm leaf collection. Pārijātaḥaraṇ is a drama written by Umāpati who lived according to Sir Grierson at the court of Harisimhadev whose reign terminated in the year 1324 A.D. It was this Harisimhadev who organised the caste system in Mithilā and founded the Pañjī (पञ्जी) in imitation of the Kulajī (कुलजी) works started by Ballāl Sendev in Bengal. Moreover he is said to have been victorious over Mahomedan forces that invaded Mithilā and it was at his court that the great scholar Caṇḍeśvar was the prime minister. For these reasons Umāpati calls him "*Hindupati*" and gives his name only once at the introduction as Hariharadeva. The work Pārijātaḥaraṇ has been available to scholars in a decent edition with translation and critical notes by Sir Grierson and published by the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.

Gupta's Palm leaf song No. 366 :

মানিনি

অরুন পূর্ব দিসা, বহলি সগরি নিসা,

গগন মগন ভেল চন্দা ।

মুদি গেলি কুমুদিনি, তইঅও তোহর ধনি,

মুদল মুখ অরবিন্দা ॥ ২ ॥

কালি ভাল কোটে, পত্র গীত্ৰ নষ্ট হয় না। দ্বিতীয় পত্র অল্প দিনে নষ্ট হইয়া যাইবার ভয়, বহু দিনের হইলে ভাঙ্গিয়া যাইবার সম্ভাবনা, দেখিতেও অপরিহার্য। পদাবলীর তালপত্র এই দ্বিতীয় শ্রেণীর। * * * । এই গ্রন্থ মহামূল্যবান। বিত্তপতির রচনা সম্বন্ধে নানাবিধ কল্পনা ও কাল্পনিক মত প্রচার করিবার সুযোগ এই পুঁথি হইতে রহিত হইবে। * * * । প্রবাস আছে যে এই তালপত্রের পুঁথি বিত্তাপতির প্রপৌত্রের লিখিত। pp. ২১৭. and ২৮৭।

ଚାନ୍ଦ ବଦନ କୁବଳୟ ଛୁଇଁ ଶୋଚନ
 ଅଧର ମଧୁରି ନିରମାନେ
 ସଗର ସରୀର କୁସୁମେ ତୁମ୍ଭ ସିରିଜ୍ଜଳ
 କିସେ ଦହ ହୃଦୟ ପଥାନେ ॥ ୫ ॥
 ଅସକତି କରୁଛ କକନ ନହି ପରିହର
 ହାର ହୃଦୟ ଭେଳ ଭାରେ ।
 ଗିରିସମ ଗରୁଡ଼ ମାନ ନହି ଯୁକ୍ତି
 ଅପୁରୁଷ ତୁମ୍ଭ ବେବହାରେ ॥ ୬ ॥
 ଅବଶୁନ ପରିହରି ହେରଥ ହରଥ ଧନି
 ମାନକ ଅବଧି ବିହାନେ ।
 ରାଜା ସିବସିଂହ ରୂପ ନରାଞ୍ଜନ
 କବି ବିଜ୍ଞାପତି ଭାନେ ॥ ୮ ॥

The same song in the Pārijātaḥaraṇ Ed. Grierson :

ଅରୁନ ପୁରୁଷ ଦିସି, ବହାଣି ସଗରି ନିସି,
 ଗଗନ ମଗନ ଭେଳ ଚନ୍ଦା ।
 ମୁନି ଗୋଲି କୁମୁଦିନି, ତହିଁ ତୋହର ଧନି,
 ମୁନଳ ମୁଖ ଅରବିନ୍ଦା ॥ ୨ ॥
 କମଳ ବଦନ କୁବଳୟ ଛୁଇଁ ଶୋଚନ
 ଅଧର ମଧୁରି ନିରମାନେ ।
 ସଗର ସରୀର କୁସୁମ ତୁମ୍ଭ ସିରିଜ୍ଜଳ
 କିଏ ତୁମ୍ଭ ହୃଦୟ ପଥାନେ ॥ ୨୫ ॥
 ମାନିନି
 ଅସକତି କର କଳ୍ପନ ନହି ପରିହସି
 ହୃଦୟ ହାର ଭେଳ ଭାରେ ।
 ଗିରିସମ ଗରୁଡ଼ ମାନ ନହି ଯୁକ୍ତି
 ଅପୁରୁଷ ତୁମ୍ଭ ବେବହାରେ ॥ ୨୬ ॥
 ମାନିନି
 ଅବଶୁନ ପରିହରି ହରଥ ହେରୁ ଧନି
 ମାନକ ଅବଧି ବିହାନେ ।
 ହିମଗିରି କୁମରି ଚରନ ହୃଦୟ ଧରି
 ସ୍ତୁତି ଉମାପତି ଭାନେ ॥ ୨୮ ॥

The palm leaf song is evidently corrupt in all the four stanzas, and especially in the beginning of the second. Umāpati gives Sanskrit verses corresponding to the stanzas, of which we give the 2nd and 3rd below.

আশ্রং তে সরসীকহেণ রচিতং নীলোৎপলাভ্যাং দৃশৌ ।

বক্কুকেন রদচ্ছদৌ তিলতরোঃ পুষ্পেণ নাসাপুটম্ ॥

ইত্যেবং বিধিনা বিধায় কুসুমৈঃ সর্বং বপুঃ কোমলম্ ।

ক্রুরং মানসমশ্রুনা পুনরিদং কস্মাদকস্মাৎ কৃতম্ ॥ ২৫ ॥

কাস্তে কিং তব কঙ্কণং ন কুচয়োৰ্ণৌ হস্তয়োঃ কঙ্কণম্ ।

দৌৰ্বলীবলয়াবলীমপি ন দৌৰ্বল্যেন বিহতশ্চি ।

হারং ভারমিবাবধারণসি চেদেবং শুক্লং মেকবং ।

মানং মানিনি কিং ন মুঞ্চসি মনাক্ তং ভাবমাবেদয় ॥ ২৭ ॥

Another song of the Palm leaf manuscript (Gupta's No. 484) gives the name of Hussein Shāh, the Pāṭhān ruler of Bengal (1494 to 1521 A.D.) and is therefore spurious. Moreover, the names of Kanhāi and Hussein are given in the same song as heroes (সাহ হসেন হুসসম নাগর). Some other discrepancies might come to light if the anthological literature of Mithilā were properly studied. The songs of the palm leaf manuscript cannot therefore be relied on as Vidyāpati's composition, especially if they do not bear the proper *bhaṇitā*. Thirty-three of the songs of the Palm leaf manuscript bear no *bhaṇitās* at all and are therefore unreliable.¹

Mr. Gupta's Nepal Manuscript (নেপালের পুঁথি) is according to Mr. Gupta himself, not copied from a good manuscript, and has mistakes and irregularities. The *bhaṇitā* is not fully written, but is of the uniform formula “ভনই বিজাপতীতাদি” (“says Vidyāpati, etc.”). Most of the songs have not even this uniform half of the *bhaṇitā* in the end, but still they are included in Mr. Gupta's collection of the songs of Vidyāpati.

¹ Guptas Nos. 47, 58, 72, 77, 79, 105, 113, 178, 184, 267, 271, 303, 335, 358, 365, 390, 424, 428, 429, 452, 453, 471, 484, 502, 587, 602, 655, 680, 684, 712, 735, 781, 840 are without any *bhaṇitās*, and included in his Palm leaf collection. Mr. Gupta has unhesitatingly accepted these songs as genuine compositions of Vidyāpati (কেবল তালপত্রের ও নেপালের পুঁথির পদ নিঃসংশয়ে গ্রহণ করিয়াছি—p. ২১৬০).

The Rāgataranginī (রাগভরঙ্গিনী) is a compilation of songs of different authors by a musician named Locan Kavi who lived at the court of Mahārāj Narapati Siṃha (1778-1798 A.D.). Evidently this is a musical compilation belonging to an age which is over three centuries after the time of Vidyāpati.

The following song of Nandipati appears as No. 147 of Gupta's compilation of Vidyāpati's songs :

সুন্দরি চলি শয়ন গৃহি না ।
চহ দিশ সখি সব কর ধরু না ॥
জইতাহি লাগু পরম ডর না ।
জৈসে সসি কাঁপে রাহ ডর না ॥
হার টুটিয় ছিড়িআএ গেল না ।
ভূষণ বসন শোটাএ গেল না ॥
রোয় রোয় কজরা দহায় গেল না ।
অলকহিঁ সিঁদুর মেটায় গেল না ॥
নন্দীপতি কহ কবি ভাননা ।
দুখ সহল সুখ পাওল না ॥

—Mithilā Gītasamgraha, Part I, by Bhol Jhā.

The following song of Rudranāth appears as No. 369 of Mr. Gupta's compilation :

পুরবিল প্রীতি অয়লছ হম হেরী ।
হমরা অবৈত বৈসল মুখ ফেরী ॥
দহিনহি বৈসলি ধনি উতরো নে দেল
নয়ন কটাক্ষ জীব হরি লেল ॥
কমল বদন ছল মন দুই ঠাম ।
কোন অবগতি মোর রহল জ্ঞান ॥
আস ধরিয় নহি করিয় নিরাস ।
হোহ প্রেম পুরাবহ আস ॥
অরুণ উদয় নিশি রহয় খোড় ।
আজ বুঝল ধনি পারথ তোর ॥
রুদ্রনাথ কবি মন দয় ভান ।
তৈও নে করী পুরুষক মান ॥ —*ibid.*

The following song of Candranāth appears as No. 280 of Gupta's compilation :

কোতুক চললি ভবন কেলি গৃহ, সজনী গে,
 সংগ দশ চহু দিশি নারি ।
 বিচ বিচ স্নানরি শোভিত, সজনী গে,
 জনি ধর মিলিত মুরারি ॥
 কাহঁ ষোড়শ কহঁ অভরন, সজনী গে,
 পহিরত অপরূপ চীর ।
 দেখি সকল রস উপজয়, সজনী গে,
 মুনিহক মন নাহি খীর ॥
 দশন নাম দাড়িম বিচ, সজনী গে,
 শির লেল ঘোঘট সম্হারি ।
 লঘু লঘু চলৈ পশু দৈ, সজনী গে,
 সকুচত অঙ্কম মারি ॥
 সখিসভ লৈকর ভলনমে' দেলনহি, সজনী গে,
 ঘুরি আএল সভ নারি ।
 কর ধয় পাস বৈস্যাওল, সজনী গে,
 হেরল বসন উঘারি ॥
 চন্দ্রনাথ ভন মন দয়, সজনী গে,
 ঈ সভ বড় বিপরীতি ।
 বৈস যুক্ত সমুচিত থিক, সজনী গে,
 তেঁ নহি মানিয় অতি ভীতি ॥

—*ibid.*

Another song ascribed to one Dhairajapati appears as Mr. Gupta's No. 686 :

আস লতা হম লগাওল, সজনী গে,
 নৈনক নীর পটায় ।
 সে ফল অব তরুণ ভেল, সজনী গে,
 আঁচর তর নে সমায় ॥

কাঁচ সাঁচ পিয়া তেজি গেল, সজনী গে,
 ভস্তু মন অঁই সৈ ভান ।
 দিন দিন ফল তরু নত ভেল, সজনী গে,
 পিয়া মন করি নে গ্যান ॥
 সভক পিয়া পরদেশ বস্তু, সজনী গে,
 আঁএল স্তুমরি সনেহ ।
 হমব কস্ত নিরদয় ভেল, সজনী গে,
 মন নহি বাঢ়য় বিবেক ॥
 ধৈরজপতি কহ ধৈরজ ধরু, সজনী গে,
 মন নহি করিয় উদাস ।
 ঋতুপতি আয় মিলত তোহি, সজনী গে,
 পুরত সকল মন আস ॥

Another of Umāpati's songs taken from the Pārijāt-haran appears in Gupta's compilation as No. 396 :

(রাধার উক্তি)

জাহি অবসর তাহি ঠাম (মাধব),
 কিয়ে বিসরল মোর নাম ॥ ২ ॥
 অব কি করব পরকার ।
 অপমস ভরল সংসার ॥ ৪ ॥
 সবহি পাওল অবকাশ ।
 জগ ভরি হো অবগাশ ॥ ৬ ॥
 কোনপরি সখি সভ সাথ ।
 উপর রহএ মোর মাথ ॥ ৮ ॥
 করম ধরম মোর বাম ।
 সকল তকর পরিণাম ॥ ১০ ॥
 জাহি দেখি হসলউ কালি ।
 সে দেবয় করতালি ॥ ১২ ॥
 ভনহি বিজ্ঞাপতি ভান ।
 অচির করিয় সমাধান ॥ ১৪ ॥

—Gupta No. 396.

কেদার রাগে গীতম্

তাহি অবসর তাহি ঠাম । মাধব ।
 কিএ বিগরল মোর নাম ॥
 আব কি করব পরকার । মাধব ।
 অপজস ভরল সঁসার ॥
 সবহ পাওল অবকাশ । মাধব ।
 জগ ভরি কর উপহাস ॥
 কোনপরি সখি সভ সাথ । মাধব ।
 উপর করব হম মাঁথ ॥
 জাহি দেখি হসলহ কালি । মাধব ।
 সে আব দেঅ করতালি ॥
 পরম করম মোর বাম । মাধব ।
 সকল তকর পরিণাম ॥
 স্তুমতি উমাপতি ভান । মাধব ।
 স্তুপহ করব সমাধান ॥
 হিন্দুপতি জিউ জান । মাধব ।
 মহেসরি দেই বিরমান ॥

—Grierson's text of P.

Evidently Gupta's text is corrupt, and meaningless in lines 6 and 9-10. Umāpati's song is sung by Satyabhāmā and addressed to Śrīkṛṣṇa when the latter had made the present of a *pārijāt* flower to Rukmiṇī, his elder queen. Here the occasion for the song is most appropriate, whereas Gupta's song is like a meaningless jargon without the proper context.

Gupta's song No. 834 is a song composed by Kavivallabh or Vallabh Kavi of Bengal. The Padakalpataru (No. 937) has the *bhaṇitā* of Kavivallabh, so also the Padaratnasār. But Gupta claims it as Vidyāpati's composition, as he says, on the authority of the late Mr. Sāradacharan Mitra. Kavi-vallabh is a song-maker (গদকর্তা) of Bengal in the artificial Brajabuli language. Several of his songs are preserved in the Padakalpataru (Nos. 97, 1006, 1007, 1010, 1011, 1020, 1022, 1060). Kavivallabh's *Rasa-kadamba*, a poetical work on Vaiṣṇav theology written in 1520 Śaka (1599 A.D.), has recently been published by the B. S. P. But this work is in pure Bengali as it ought to be. Several of Kavivallabh's songs have been taken into Gupta's compilation of Vidyāpati from the *Gitacintāmaṇi* (গীতচিন্তামণি).¹

Gupta's song No. 42 which goes without any *bhaṇitā* has different *bhaṇitās* in different anthologies of Bengal; e.g., Padakalpataru No. 194 has the name of Vidyāpati, but Kamalā Kānta Dās's Padaratnākar attributes the same song to Raṅjan. Mr. Gupta does not mention the source from which he collects this song.

Gupta's song No. 6 (p. 529) is attributed to 'Daśa Avadhān' who was patronised by Ālam Shāha, but it is anonymous in the Padakalpataru (No. 245). Gupta has taken this song from the *Rāgatarṅgiṇī*, and quotes from a Maithilī commentary that Vidyāpati was called 'Daśa Avadhān' which title he got from a Delhi Durbar. The tradition that Vidyāpati effected the release of his master Sivasimha, who was a captive in the court of a Pāt Shāh of Delhi is not tenable with the tradition that allots a rule of

¹ গীতচিন্তামণিতেও বিদ্যাপতির অনেকগুলি পদ আছে। কিন্তু তাঁহার বলিয়া আমরা জানি না।
Gupta's introduction p. ১৯/১

3½ years to Śiva Siṁha. The subject has been discussed in connection with the description of the poet's *Puruṣaparīkṣā*.¹

Mr. Gupta himself notes a discrepancy between the text of his song No. 16 as preserved in the *palm leaf manuscript* and that of the *Rāgataranginī*. The latter attributes the song to one Ratna Kavi (Kavi Ratanāi) who had been patronised by Devalā Devī and Lakhan Dev (king). Mr. Gupta does not try to identify this king Lakhan Dev.

Gupta's No. 22 is professedly the correction of a Bengali song published by the Baṭṭalā Press.

Gupta's No. 33 is an anonymous song taken from an anthology of Bengal, the *Kīrtanānanda*.

Gupta's No. 34 (*Paṭlakalpataru* No. 197) and No. 44 (*Paṭlakalpataru* No. 201) give the name of Nasarat Shāh, the Pāthan ruler of Bengal (1521—1526 A.D.) whose time is a century later than the time of Vidyāpati. Gupta's song No. 484 gives the name of Hussein Shāh (1494—1521 A.D.). Mahāmahopādhyāy Haraprasād Śāstri suggests that this Hussein might have been the last independent ruler of Jounpur who ruled for a few months only in 1457 A.D.; but this is not in agreement with the tradition of Vidyāpati's death in 1448 A.D., and moreover it is not likely that Vidyāpati had any occasion whatever to praise this weak ruler of Jounpur. The songs (34, 44, 484) are most probably the composition of some Bengali poet or poets at the time of the Pāthan rulers, Hussein Shāh and Nasarat Shāh (1494—1526). It is to be remembered that Gupta's song No. 484 appears in his palm leaf manuscript (তালপত্রের পুঁথি).

Gupta's song No. 268 names Gyāsadev who is apparently Ghiās-ud-din 'Azam who was ruler of Bengal during 1390-1412 A.D. The expression চিরেঁ জীব জীবখু (so too is চিরেঁ জীব রহ in No. 44) is rather tautological as the portion চিরেঁ জীব ('long live')

¹ মৈথিল পুঁথিতে আছে "বিজ্ঞাপতি কা উপাধি দশাবধান ছল যে দিল্লী দরবার সে ভেটল ছল।"

* * । প্রবাদ আছে যে বন্দী শিবসিংহকে দিল্লীর বাদশাহ বিজ্ঞাপতির গীত শ্রবণে সন্তুষ্ট হইয়া মুক্ত করিয়া দেন। এই প্রবাদের যথার্থ্য কতক এই পদ হইতে প্রমাণিত হইতেছে। আলম শাহ কে ঠিক বলিতে পারা যায় না। আলম শাহ নাম ও উপাধি দুই হইতে পারে। আলম শাহের বাঙ্গালা প্রতিশব্দ নরপতি।—Mr. Gupta's comment on the song.

has the full sense. The Padakalpataru (No. 201) preserves a better reading (of No. 44) which is “চিরজীব রহ,” and this avoids the tautology. This song (No. 268) has enabled Mr. Gupta to come to the conclusion that Vidyāpati composed songs prior to 1373 A.D. to please the Mahomedan ruler.¹

Many of Mr. Gupta's songs appear with double *bhanitās*. Govindadās's name appears joined to that of Vidyāpati in Gupta's song Nos. 81, 86, 210, 538, 596, 624, 665, 669 and 703. Rādhāmohan Dās's name appears joined to that of Vidyāpati in No. 615.

Vidyāpati has been imitated both in Mithilā and in Bengal. In Mithilā, he has been like Kālidās of Sanskrit Literature, and many amusing stories are current about him, and many songs composed by subsequent poets have been attributed to him. In Bengal there were perhaps more imitators than in Mithilā, and many of them wrote in the name of Vidyāpati. In consequence of this it is now difficult to separate the genuine from the imitations. Sir Grierson discovered this long ago, and noted it in his introduction to the Maithili grammar which is a master-piece in the grammatical literature of Indian languages. Mr. Gupta has added to this difficulty by translating as many of these Bengali songs as could be translated. The following is an example.

Padakalpataru song No. 238

একদিন হেরি হেরি হাসি হাসি যায় ।
আর দিন নাম ধরি মুরলী বাজায় ॥
আজি অতি নিয়ড়ে করয়ে পরিহাস ।
না জানিয়ে গকুলে কাহার নিবাস ॥
শুন সজনি ও নাগর শ্রামরাজ ।
মূল বিহু পর ধন মাগয় বেয়াজ ॥

Gupta's song No. 74

একদিন হেরি হেরি হাসি হাসি যায় ।
অরু দিন নাম ধর মুরলি বাজায় ॥
আজু অতি নিয়রে করল পরিহাস ।
ন জানিয় গোঁকুল ককর নিবাস ॥
সজনি ও নাগর সামরাজ ।
মূলবিহু পর ধনে মাগ বেয়াজ ॥

¹ বোধ হয় এই গ্যাসদেব গ্যাসউদ্দীন, বঙ্গদেশের পাঠানবংশীয় রাজা । ১৩৭৩ খ্রীষ্টাব্দে গ্যাসউদ্দীনের মৃত্যু হয় । শিবসিংহের দানপত্রের কাল প্রচলিত বিশ্বাস মতে খৃষ্টাব্দ ১৪০০ । খৃষ্ট-চতুর্দশ-শতাব্দীর ত্রিতীয়ার্ধে বিদ্যাপতি জন্ম গ্রহণ করেন । ১৩৭৩ সালের পূর্বে তিনি কবিতা রচনা করিয়াছিলেন, ইহাতে সংশয়ের কোনও কারণ নাই । মহলম (মালুম) ও মুলতান এই দুই শব্দের সম্মিলনে অজুমান হয় যে পদটি গ্যাসউদ্দীনের মনস্তত্ত্বের জন্য রচিত ও সম্ভবত তাঁহার সাক্ষাতে গীত ।

অতি পরিচয় নাহি দেখি আন কাজ ।
 না করয়ে সন্মম না করয়ে লাজ ॥
 আপনা নেহারি নেতারে তহু মোর ।
 দেই আলিঙ্গন হইয়া বিভোর ॥
 খেনে খেনে বৈদগ্ধি কলা অহুপান ।
 অধিক উদার দেখিএ পরিণাম ॥
 বিজ্ঞাপতি কহে আরতি ওর ।
 বুঝই না বুঝই ইহ রস বোল ॥

অতি পরিচয় নহি দেখি আন কাজ
 ন করয় সন্মম ন করয় লাজ ॥
 আপনা নিহারি নিহারি তহু মোর ।
 দেই আলিঙ্গন ভএ বিভোর ॥
 খনে খনে বৈদগ্ধি কলা রহুপাম ।
 অধিক উদার দেখিয় পরিণাম ॥
 বিজ্ঞাপতি কহ আরতি ওর ।
 বুঝই ন বুঝই ইহ রস ভোর ॥

Gupta's Songs Nos. 824, 605, 658, 647, 573, 555, 551, 533, 385, 380, 381, 354, 209 and many more are translations of Bengali songs current in Bengal.

With the anxiousness to increase the number of Vidyāpati's songs, Mr. Gupta has in several instances given the same song twice, when owing to different readings they appear to be slightly different from each other. Gupta's Nos. 158 and 159 might be brought forward as an example.

Several anonymous songs from the Bengal anthologies have been included in Mr. Gupta's compilation. Nos. 70, 111, 143, 156, 209, 288, 277, 323, 338 339, 382, 385, 398, 403, 409, 529, 542, 543, 572, 579, 593 and many more are anonymous songs of this type taken (with certain alterations) from the anthologies of Bengal.

All songs bearing the *bhaṇitās* of Śekhara, Kaviśekhara, Rāy-śekhara, Vallabh, Kavi-vallabh, Bhūpati, Simha Bhūpati, Bhūpati-nāth, Kavirañjan, Kavi-kaṇṭhahār, Kaṇṭhahār, Jaydev, Abhinava Jaydev, Daśa Avadhān, Pañcānan, Kavi-vara-śekhara, Campati, Campatipati, Saras, Saras Kavi, Saras Rām, Lakhimīnāth (No. 163), Kamsanārāyaṇ, Rudradhar, Rājapaṇḍit and others have been indiscriminately absorbed in Mr. Gupta's compilation of Vidyāpati's songs.

Gupta's song No. 272 has the *bhaṇitā* of a Haripati. Mr. Gupta includes it in his compilation on a very flimsy argument. As Haripati (mark the difference in name) was the name of Vidyāpati's son, it has been thought very likely that a song composed by

Vidyāpati has got the *bhaṇitā* of his son. It is however a well observed fact that Vidyāpati was respected and imitated ; and songs composed by others got the *bhaṇitā* of Vidyāpati—the reverse of this has not yet been noticed.¹

It is in this way that Mr. Gupta has been able to give us 935 songs in his compilation from the following sources :

Gupta's Palm leaf MS.	about 350 songs
„ Nepal MS.	about 300 songs
Padakalpataru	about 350 songs
Kīrtanānanda	several songs
Rāgatarangīnī	several songs
Total	about 1000 + several
Actual number in the compilation	935.

¹ এই পদ হরিপতি ভণিতা যুক্ত পাওয়া গিয়াছে। বিদ্যাপতির পুত্রের নাম হরিপতি ছিল।
বিদ্যাপতির রচিত পদে তাঁহার পুত্রের অথবা আর কাহারও নাম দেওয়াই সম্ভব মনে হয়।

THE PADAS OF CAṆḌIDĀSA

BY

MANINDRAMOHAN BOSE, M.A.

The Padas of Caṇḍidāsa are the richest treasure of the Bengali literature. They are attractive for their excellence and simplicity, but the love-romance of the songs is more enjoyable. Many attempts have been made to compile a complete collection of the Padas of Caṇḍidāsa, and many renowned scholars set their hands to this matter, with the result that many editions of the Padāvali of Caṇḍidāsa have been published. Even now we hear of the discovery of new songs of Caṇḍidāsa, so, the process of addition is still going on. But the time has come to apply critical tests to the songs of this poet in order to see that a particular Pada attributed to him is really the composition of Caṇḍidāsa, and not of some other poet. In fact, we find that some of the songs which are passing in the name of Caṇḍidāsa are attributed to other poets in some of the manuscript works. The following two songs are typical examples of this nature :—

1. In the manuscript (No. 3436, C. U. L.) we have :—

পীরিতি বলিয়ে	একটা কমল
রূপীহু হীয়ার মাঝে ।	
প্রেম-পরিমল	লোভিত ভ্রমর
ধায়ল আপন কাজে ॥	
ভ্রমরা জানএ	কমল মাধুরী
তেয়ি দে তাহার বস ।	
রসিক জানএ	রসের চাতুরি
আনে কহে অপজস ॥	
সুজন কুজন	জে জন না জানে
তাহারে কহিব কি ।	
পরানে পরানে	জে জন মীলয়ে
তাহারে পরান দি ॥	

ধরম করম লোক চরাচর
 একথা বুঝিতে নারে ॥
 জাহার রিদএ এ তিন আখর
 সেই সে বুঝিতে পারে ॥
 কহে নরহরি যুনগো ধ্বন্দ্বরী
 পীরিতি রসের সার ।
 পীরিতি রসের রসিক নইলে
 কি ছার জীবন তার ॥

In the Sāhitya Pariṣad Edition of Caṇḍīdāsa we have :—

পীরিতি বলিয়া একটী কমল
 রসের সায়র মাঝে ।
 প্রেম-পরিমল লুবধ ভ্রমর
 ধাওল আশন কাজে ॥
 ভ্রমর জানয়ে কমল-মাধুরী
 তেঁই সে তাহার বশ ।
 রসিক জানয়ে রসের চাতুরী
 আনে করে অপযশ ॥

সই, একথা বুঝিবে কে ।
 যে জন জানয়ে সে যদি না কহে
 কেমনে ধরিব দে ॥
 ধরম করম লোক চরচাতে
 এ কথা বুঝিতে নারে ।
 এ তিন আখর যাহার মরমে
 সেই সে বুঝিতে পারে ॥
 কহে চণ্ডীদাস শুন হে নাগরি
 পীরিতি রসের সার ।
 পীরিতি রসের রসিক নহিলে
 কি ছার জীবন তার ॥

These two Padas are almost similar, with the exception of a few lines in the middle part where we have in the manuscript :—

সহজন কুজন জে জন না জানে
তাহারে কহিব কি ।
পরার্থে পরাণে জে জন মীলয়ে
তাহারে পরাণ দি ॥

But in the Parisad Edition, we have :—

সই, এ কথা বুঝিবে কে ।
যে জন জানয়ে সে যদি না কহে
কেমনে ধরিব দে ॥

২. In the manuscript (No. 3436, C. U. L.) we have :—

সহজ বুঝিবে কে ।
তিমির আধার হইয়াছে পার
সহজে পসেচে সে ॥
চান্দ্রের কাছেতে অবলা জে আছে
সেই সে রসেরি সার ।
বিসেতে অমুতে একন্তে মিলন
কে বুঝে মরম তার ॥
বাহিরে তাহার একটা দুয়ার
ভিতরে তিনটা আছে ।
চোতুর হইয়ে দুইটা ছাড়িয়ে
থাকিবে একেরি কাছে ॥
জেন আশ্ব ফল ভিতর বাহির
কুসি ছাল তার কসা ।
তার আশ্বাদন জানএ জে জন
করএ তাহার আসা ॥
সহজ জানিতে সাদ করে চিতে
সহজে সহজ বড় ।
আপনা বুঝিএ যুজন দেখিয়ে
পীরিতি করিবে দড় ॥

চাঁদের কাছে অবলা আছে
 সেই সে পীরিত্তি সার ।
 বিধে অমৃততে মিলন একত্রে
 কে বুঝিবে মরম তার ॥
 বাহিরে তাহার একটি ছয়া
 ভিতরে তিনটি আছে ।
 চতুর হইয়া হইকে ছাড়িয়া
 থাকিবে একের কাছে ॥
 যেন আশ্রয় অতি সে রসাল
 বাহিরে কুশী ছাল কষা ।
 ইহার আশ্বাদন বুঝে যেই জন
 করহ তাহার আশা ॥
 অভাগিয়া কাকে স্বাহ নাহি জানে
 মজয়ে নিষের ফলে ।
 রসিক কোকিল জ্ঞানের প্রভাবে
 মজয়ে চূত-মুকুলে ॥
 নবীন মদন আছে একজন
 গোকুলে তাহার থানা ।
 কামবীজ সহ ব্রজ-বধুগণ
 করে তার উপাসনা ॥
 সহজ কথাটি মনে করি রাখ
 শুনলো রজক-ঝি ।
 বাণুলী-আদেশে জানিবে বিশেষে
 আমি আর বলিব কি ॥
 রূপ-করণাতে পারিবে মিলিতে
 যুচিবে মনের ধান্দা ।
 কহে চণ্ডীদাস পুরিবেক আশ
 তবে ত থাইবে সুধা ॥

It will thus be evident that there is some difficulty in the identification of the real author of some of the Padas. But there

is perhaps a critical test which can help us a great deal in this direction. It appears that the practice of putting oneself as the follower of some Manjarī (Sakhī of Rādhā) in the colophon is comparatively modern. Let us take up a few famous Vaiṣṇava writers :—

1. (a) Caṇḍīdāsa was the worshipper of Vāsuntī, and hence he often puts himself in the colophon as the follower of that goddess, as :—

In the Padas :—

কহে চণ্ডীদাসে বাণ্ডলী আদেশে
হেরিয়ে নখের কোণে ।
জনম সফলে বিহি আনি দিল
এমন কোন না জনে ॥

Parīṣad Edition, p. 15.

চণ্ডীদাসে কয় বাণ্ডলী কুপায়
আর নিবেদিব কায় ।

Ibid, p. 151.

চণ্ডীদাসের মন বাণ্ডলী চরণ
উপদেশ রজকী নারী ।

Ibid, p. 152.

Or, (b) sometimes as Dvija Caṇḍīdāsa :—

দ্বিজ চণ্ডীদাস বলে পীরিতি এমতি ।
যার যত জালা তার ততই পীরিতি ॥

Ibid, p. 97.

Or, (c) sometimes as Baḍu Caṇḍīdāsa (বড়ু চণ্ডীদাস) :—

ধৈর্য নাহিক তায় ।
বড়ু চণ্ডীদাস গায় ॥

Ibid, p. 38.

Or, (d) sometimes he puts his name in the colophon with some characteristic remark peculiar to him about the subject treated in the Padas :—

চণ্ডীদাস কহে রাখি কুলশীল
পূরাহ মনের সাধা ॥

Ibid, p. 38.

কহে চণ্ডীদাস শুন রসময়
এত কি দানের লেখা ।
এ ঘাটে তরুণী গোপের রমণী
আর কি পাইবে দেখা ॥

Ibid, p. 66.

কহে চণ্ডীদাসে বড় অপরূপ বাণী ।
চুড়া বাধি মুরলী শিখয়ে বিনোদিনী ॥

Ibid, p. 208.

In the *Srikr̥ṣṇa Kīrtana*, the author puts himself as Baḍu Candīdāsa, a follower of Vāsali :—

বাসলী শিরে বন্দী চণ্ডীদাস গাএ ।

Parīṣad Edition, p. 264.

গাইল বড় চণ্ডীদাস বাসলীগণে ।

Ibid, p. 265.

বাসলী-চরণ শিরে বন্দিআ
গাইল বড় চণ্ডীদাসে ॥

Ibid, p. 80.

2. Vidyāpati also has his own way of putting himself in the colophon. Sometimes he does this with some appropriate remarks about the subject treated in the Padas, or sometimes he praises Śiva Simha, Rūp Nārāyaṇa, and Lakhimā :—

ভনই বিজ্ঞাপতি গাবে ।
বড় পুনে শুনমতি পুনমত পাবে ।

Parīṣad Edition, p. 11.

ভনই বিজ্ঞাপতি ন বোল সম্বেহা ।

স্বপুরুষ বচন পসানক রেহা ॥

Ibid, p. 315.

ভনই বিজ্ঞাপতি সুন বর নাগর

সবহ হোয়ত পরকার ।

রাজা শিবসিংহ রূপনারায়ণ

লখিমা-কন্ত উদার ॥

Ibid, p. 75.

ভনই বিজ্ঞাপতি অরে বর জৌবতি

এহ পরতথ পঁচবানে ।

রাজা শিব সিংহ রূপনারায়ণ

লখিমা দেবি রমানে ॥

Ibid, p. 367.

3. Narottama generally puts himself as the disciple of Lokanātha Dāsa :—

লোকনাথ প্রভুর পদ হৃদয়ে বিলাস ।

প্রেমভক্তিচন্দ্রিকা কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

Premabhakti Candrikā.

শ্রীশঙ্কর করুণাসিন্ধু

অধম জনার বন্ধু

লোকনাথ লোকের জীবন ।

হা হা ! প্রভু ! কর দয়া

দেহ মোরে পদছায়া

নরোত্তম লইল শরণ ॥

Prārthanā (4).

Or, sometimes he praises some other Vaiṣṇava worthies :—

রূপ রঘুনাথ পদে রহা মোর আশ ।

প্রার্থনা করয়ে সদা নরোত্তম দাস ॥

Ibid (1).

দয়া কর আচার্য্য প্রভু শ্রীশ্রীনিবাস ।

রামচন্দ্র সঙ্গ মাগে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

Ibid (14).

শ্রীকৃষ্ণ-চৈতন্ত-প্রভু-দাস অম্বদাস ।

নরোত্তমদাস করে এই অভিলাষ ॥

Ibid (27).

4. Vāsudeva Ghoṣa thus puts himself :—

বাসুদেব ঘোষ কহে মনে করি আশা ।

গৌরপদ-দ্বন্দ্ব মনে করিয়া ভরসা ॥

Padāvalī (1).

বাসুদেব ঘোষে বলে, ধর ধর কর কোলে,

গোরা মোর পরাণের পরাণী ॥

Ibid (6).

কুসুম জিনিয়া অঙ্গ গন্ধ মনোহরা ।

বাসু কহে কি দিয়া গড়িল বিধি গোরা ॥

Ibid (7).

ধৈর্য না বাক্যে মোর মনে ।

বাসুদেব ঘোষ রস জানে ॥

Ibid (20).

বাসুদেব ঘোষে কয় মনের হরিষে ।

কত নিদ্রা যাও গোরা প্রেমের আলসে ॥

Ibid (44).

গোরা বিহু প্রাণ রহে এই বড় লাজ ।

বাসু কহে কেনে মুণ্ডে না গড়িল বাজ ॥

Ibid (10).

5. Govinda Dāsa generally puts himself with some remark about the subject-matter of the Pada, peculiar to him :—

গোবিন্দ দাস কহে উঠি চলু সুন্দরী,

বিঘটন কাহুক পীরিতি ।

Ekāṇṇa Pada (3).

রজনী পোহায়ল গুরুজন জাগল
গোবিন্দদাস বলি যাই ।

Ibid (5).

কত কত উপজল রস পরসঙ্গ ।
গোবিন্দদাস তহি দেখত কত রঙ্গ ॥

Ibid (28).

গোবিন্দ দাসিয়া কয় চরণেতে ধরি ।
এখনি আনিয়া দিব তোমার প্রাণহরি ॥

Padāvalī (323).

গোবিন্দদাস কহ এতহ না জানহ
কুব্জা অব নব রাণী ।

Ibid (358).

6. Vṛndāvana Dāsa, the reputed author of the Caitanya Bhāgavat, scrupulously makes use of the following formula :—

শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য নিত্যানন্দচান্দ জ্ঞান ।
বৃন্দাবন দাস তছু পদ যুগে গান ॥

This is invariably found at the end of every chapter of his book.

7. Locana Dāsa, in his Caitanya Mangala, generally speaks of his Guru Narahari :—

ঠাকুর শ্রীনরহরি দাস প্রাণ অধিকারী
যার পদপ্রতি আশে আশ ।
অধমেহ সাধ করে, গোরাগুণ গাহিবারে
সে ভরসা এ লোচন দাস ॥

p. 2.

আমার ঠাকুর প্রভু নরহরি দাস ।
প্রণতি বিনতি করে' পূর' মোর আশ ॥

p. 3.

শ্রীনরহরি দাস পদ করি আশ
লোচনদাস গুণগায় ॥

p. 37.

8. Jayānanda thus puts himself :—

চিস্তিয়া চৈতন্ত গদাধর-পদধ্বজ ।
আদিখণ্ড জয়ানন্দ করিল প্রবন্ধ ॥

Caitanya Mangala, p. 5.

চিস্তিয়া চৈতন্ত-গদাধর-পদধ্বজ ।
বিশ্বরূপ-সন্ন্যাস গাইল জয়ানন্দ ॥

Ibid, p. 21.

চিস্তিয়া চৈতন্ত গদাধর পদধ্বজ ।
আনন্দে উত্তরখণ্ড গাঁএ জয়ানন্দ ॥

Ibid, p. 152.

9. Jadunandana Dāsa in his Karmānanda speaks of Hemalata, the daughter of Śrinivāsa Ācāryya :—

শ্রীআচার্য্য প্রভুর কথা শ্রীল হেমলতা ।
প্রেমকল্লবলী কিবা নিরমল ধাতা ॥
সে হুই চরণ-পদ্ম হৃদয়ে বিলাস ।
কর্ণানন্দ-রস কহে বহনন্দন দাস ॥

We have thus dealt with some of the principal Vaiṣṇava poets. By way of further verification let us now take up some other Vaiṣṇava poets, as also the other works of some of the poets we have treated above.

1. Kṛṣṇa Dāsa translated in Bengali the Camatkāra Candrikā, a Sanskrit work written by Viśvanāth Chakravarty, who was living about 1662 Saka. He thus puts himself in this book :—

শ্রীচৈতন্ত নিত্যানন্দ পদে করি আশ ।
প্রথম কুতূহল লীলা কহে কৃষ্ণদাস ॥

Note. This Kṛṣṇa Dāsa is not the celebrated author of the Caritāmṛta, who flourished about a century before.

2. In the Rasakalpa Latikā, Locana Dāsa thus puts himself in the colophon :—

শ্রীনরহরি পাদ-পদ্ম করি মনে আশ ।

রসকল্প-লতিকা কহে লোচন দাস ॥ p. 4.

3. In the Upāsanā Paṭala by Narottama Dāsa, the author thus puts himself :—

বৈষ্ণব গোসাঞি কর ক্রিপা নিরক্ষণ ।

বিকাইলু তব পায় দেহ প্রেম ধন ॥

রামচন্দ্র কবিরাজ মোর মোক্ষার্ণব ।

উপাসনা তত্ত্ব কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

This we quote from the Calcutta University manuscript No. 557. written about the year 1069 B.S.

4. In the Upāsanā Tattva which is spoken of as the tenth chapter of Guru-Śiṣya Sainvāda written by Narottama Dāsa, the author thus puts himself in the colophon :—

শ্রীলোকনাথ ঠাকুর চরণ স্মরণ অভিলাস ।

গুরুসিষ্ঠ সন্থাদ কহেন নরোত্তম দাস ॥

Note. This we quote from the Calcutta University manuscript No. 558 written on the 13th Vaiśākḥ of 1069 B.S.

5. In a work named Svarūpa Varṇana, we have the following :—

শ্রীরূপ রঘুনাথ পদে জার আস ।

স্বরূপবর্ণন কিছু কহে কৃষ্ণ দাস ॥

The mention of Rūpa and Raghunāth in the colophon seems to indicate that the writer may be the author of the celebrated Caitanya Caritāmṛta. But this is far from being the case. We have the following lines in the same work—

গোপালভট্টের শিষ্ঠ আচার্য্য শ্রীনিবাস ।

তার সঙ্গে রয়ে সদা বৃন্দাবন দাস ॥

লোকনাথ গোস্বামির শিষ্য কহি তার নাম ।

ঠাকুর শ্রীনরোত্তম অতি অল্পপাম ॥ etc.

This shows that the book was written after Śrinivāṣa and Narottama acquired fame in Bengal. The respectful manner in which these two Vaiṣṇava worthies are mentioned in the poem shows that this could not have been done by the author of the *Caritāmṛta*. We quote the above from the Calcutta University manuscript No. 559, dated 1071 B.S.

6. In another work Narottama thus puts himself :—

শ্রীচৈতন্য নিত্যানন্দ অবৈত চরণ ।

দস্তে তুণ করি মাথোঁ দেহ ছচরণ ॥

তোমা সভার পদ রজ চিতে অভিলাস ।

উপাসনা-পটল কহে শ্রীনরোত্তম দাস ॥

Note :—This work is dated 1087 B.S. We quote this from the Calcutta University manuscript No. 563.

7. In the *Dipakojjvala Grantha* by Baṁśī Dāsa, the author thus puts himself :—

শ্রীশুভ পাদ পড়ে সদা জার আস ।

পঞ্চম অধ্যায় কথা কহে বংশিদাস ॥

Note.—We quote this from the Calcutta University manuscript No. 564.

8. In the *Rādhārāsa Kārikā* dated 1081 B.S., Narottama puts himself as :—

শ্রীলোকনাথ গোস্বামির পাদ পদ্ম করি আস ।

রাধা-রস-কারিকা কহে শ্রীনরোত্তম দাস ॥

9. And in the *Pada Kalpataru* we have a host of other poets expressing themselves in similar manner :—

নিরমল গৌর প্রেমরস সিঞ্চে

পূরল সব মন আশ ।

সো চরণাঙ্ঘুজে রতি নাহি হোয়ল

রোয়ত বৈষ্ণব দাস ॥ p. 1. (Parisād Edition)

- যো রসে ভাসি অবশ মহিমগুল
গোবিন্দ দাস তহিঁ পরশ না ভেলি ॥ p. 3.
কহে বৃন্দাবন অধৈত চরণ
হিয়ার মাঝারে ধরি ॥ p. 5.
জয় জয় গৌর অভিন্ন কলেবর ।
কুকরই কাতর দাস মনোহর ॥ p. 5.
আপন করম দোষে ভেল বঞ্চিত
ছুরমতি বৈষ্ণবদাস ॥ p. 6.
চণ্ডীদাস পদে যার রতি সেই
পিরিতি মরম জানে ।
পিরিতি বিহীন জনে ধিক্ রহ
দাস নরহরি ভণে । p. 12.
জ্ঞান দাস কহে বৃন্দল অসঙ্গে । p. 61.
কহে রাধামোহন প্রেম-তরঙ্গ ॥ p. 63.

We have here given a sufficiently long list of the Vaiṣṇava authors, but with none of them we find it customary to express himself as the follower of a Manjari or Sakhi of Rādhā in the colophon of a Pada. We have already observed that the earlier Vaiṣṇava poets usually made some characteristic remarks, peculiar to them, about the subjects treated in the Padas, or owned themselves as the disciples of their Gurus in the colophons. They had gone thus far, but no further, in this respect.

There is another important point to be noted here. There is a tendency among the Bengali Vaiṣṇavas to proclaim Caitanya as an incarnation of Kṛṣṇa. Rāma and his brothers are said to be Viṣṇu incarnated in four parts, and Lakṣmī born in the form of Sītā. In the Mahābhārata, Kṛṣṇa is Viṣṇu, Yudhiṣṭhira is Dharma, Arjuna is Indra, Bhīma is Pavana and so on with other personages. It is also believed that when God incarnates Himself, His associates in heaven are also born as His associates on earth. Working on this principle the Bengali Vaiṣṇavas have identified Caitanya and his companions with Kṛṣṇa and his associates in the Dvāpara Age. Thus, Caitanya is Kṛṣṇa, and his wife is Lakṣmī, the consort of Viṣṇu in Heaven. Advaita is Mahādeva, who with Viṣṇu

and Brahmā form the Hindu Trinity. Nityānanda is Balarāma, the elder brother of Kṛṣṇa in the Dvāpara age. Other Vaiṣṇava worthies have also been identified in a similar manner. Thus—

Abhirāma Thākura	is Śrīdāma
Sundarānanda	„ Sudāma
Dhananjaya Pandit	„ Vasudāma
Gourīdās Pandit	„ Subala
Kamalākara Pipalai	„ Mahābala
Uddhāraṇa Datta	„ Subāhu
Moheṣa Pandit	„ Mahābāhu
Puruṣottama Dāsa	„ Stoka Kṛṣṇa
Parameśvara Dāsa	„ Arjuna
Kālā Kṛṣṇa Dāsa	„ Labanga
Śrīdhara Pandit	„ Madhumangala
Halāudha Thākura	„ Bala Deva
etc. etc.	

(From Gauragaṇoddeśadīpikā, Ślokaś 126-135.)

And a host of other worthies have been similarly identified. The list is too numerous to be mentioned here. But it is to be noted that in this identification not a single Vaiṣṇava has been identified with a Sakhi or any female companion of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. There is also a tendency to identify some of the Vaiṣṇavas with the Sakhis of Rādhā. Thus—

Gadādhara Pandit	is Rādhā
Rūpa Goswāmī	„ Lalitā
Rai Rāmānanda	„ Bisākhā
Śivānanda	„ Sucitrā
Rāmānanda	„ Campakalatā
Govinda Ghose	„ Ranga Devī
Vāsu Ghose	„ Sudevī
Mādhava Ghose	„ 'Tungā
Govindānanda	„ Indurekhā

(From 'aitanya Saṅgītā, p. 25.)

Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj	is Ratnarekhā
Ciraṅjīva Sen	„ Rupakaṅṭhī
Sadāśiva Kavirāj	„ Candrāvalī

(Father of
Puruṣottama
Thākura = Stoka Sakhā)
Kangṣārī Sen is Ratnāvalī
(Father of Sadāsiva)
(Taken from Gaurāṅga Sevaṅga Patrikā.)

Even the Manjarīs have been similarly identified—

সৌভাগ্য মঞ্জরি নাম দাস গদাধর ।

* * *

শ্রীরূপ মঞ্জরি হয় শ্রীরূপ গোসাক্ষি ।

And লবঙ্গ মঞ্জরি হয় গোসাক্ষি সনাতন ।

রতি মঞ্জরি হয় রঘুনাথ দাস ।

অনঙ্গ মঞ্জরি হয় গোপাল ভট্ট ।

রস মঞ্জরি হয় রঘুনাথ ভট্ট ।

আনন্দ মঞ্জরি হয় লোকনাথ ।

বিলাস মঞ্জরি হয় জীব গোস্বামী ।

কঙ্করি মঞ্জরি হয় কৃষ্ণদাস কবিরাজ ।

etc.,

etc.

(From Rāgamālā by Narottama
Dāsa, Calcutta University
manuscript No. 565, pp. 5-6.)

We here find three grades of identification. In the first grade the male mates of Kṛṣṇa are identified with the companions of Caitanya. In the second grade the Sakhīs or chief companions of Rādhā are identified with some of the Vaiṣṇavas. In the third grade, the Manjarīs or the companions of the chief Sakhīs are also identified with some of the notable Vaiṣṇavas. A further long list can also be supplemented.

Let us now see what lies at the root of bringing these Sakhīs and Manjarīs into such prominence.

In the Caitanya Caritāmṛta (2-8-110) we have—

প্রেমের পরম দার মহাভাব জানি ।

সেই মহাভাবরূপ রাধাষ্টাকুরাণী ॥

And মহাভাব চিন্তামনি রাধার স্বরূপ ।

ললিতাদি সখী তাঁর কায় বৃহৎ রূপ ॥

This shows that Rādhā is the personification of the purest divine emotion and her Sakhīs are the metaphorical representations of the finer elements of that emotion. This is a characteristic feature of the Vaiṣṇava theology which is too well-known to require any further elucidation. Even Kṛṣṇa is said to have incarnated himself as Caitanya Deva in order to taste this love of Rādhā. (Caitanya Caritāmṛta, 1-1-6). Now, this divine love is of two kinds—Mukhya and Gauṇa. The former is further subdivided into five finer emotions, called Śānta, Patrī, Preya, Vātsalya and Madhura ; and the latter into seven finer emotions, such as, Hāsyā, Adbhuta, Vira, Karuṇa, Raudra, Bhayānaka and Vibhatsa. Even these finer emotions are said to be tinged each with a particular colour of its own, such as, Sveta (white), Chitra, Aruṇa (orange), Rōṇa (Blood-red), Śyāma (green), Pāndura (straw-colour), Pingala (yellow), Gaura (indigo), Dhumra (ash-like), Rakta (red), Kāla (black) and Nīla (blue). (Bhaktirasāmṛta, South, 5164-7)

These twelve finer emotions at once remind us of the twelve Sakhīs of Rādhā. Many writers have even ascribed a particular colour to a Manjarī, such as—

শ্রীললিতাজিউ গোরচনা বর্ণ... ।

শ্রীবিশাখাজিউ বিদ্যাত বর্ণ...

শ্রীচিত্রাজিউ কুঙ্কুম বর্ণ... ।

শ্রীচম্পকলতা জিউ চম্পকবর্ণ... ।

শ্রীশ্রীতুঙ্গবিজ্ঞা জিউ চন্দনমিশ্রিত কুঙ্কুম বর্ণ... ।

শ্রীইন্দুরেখা জিউ হরিতালবর্ণ... ।

ইত্যাদি

(From Guṇātmikā, C. U. Manuscript No. 560.)

Then about the Manjaris. The conception is that each Sakhi has a number of female companions who are designated as Manjarīs. They have received due attention from the Vaiṣṇava poets. Not only the colour of the body and of the wearing cloth (Sārī) of each has been ascertained, but the age even in years, months and days has been fixed.

Let us now see how these Manjaris came to be associated with the names of the poets in the colophons.

From the fact that in the post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava literature special importance is attached to Kṛṣṇa's adopting the emotions of Rādhā in the form of Caitanya Deva for tasting divine love, the idea that each devotee should similarly adopt a particular emotion for spiritual culture, captivated the imagination of the Bengali Vaiṣṇavas. Even Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj in his Caitanya Caritamṛta writes as follows :—

এবে এক সখীগণের ইহা অধিকার ।

সখী হৈতে হয় এই লীলার বিস্তার ॥

সখী বিহু এই লীলা পুষ্টি নাহি হয় ।

And সখী বিহু এই লীলায় নাহি অণ্ডের গতি ॥

2-81188-139.

Also সেই গোপী-ভাবায়ুতে যার লোভ হয় ।

বেদ ধর্ম সর্ব তেজি সেই কৃষ্ণেরে ভজয় ॥

2-8-149.

অতএব গোপীভাব করি অঙ্গীকার ।

রাত্রিদিনে চিন্ত রাধাকৃষ্ণের বিহার ॥

2-8-155.

This idea has been variously elaborated by the Vaiṣṇava writers of later age, and the Manjaris or Sakhi's of Rādhā have risen to paramount importance in the Vaiṣṇava theology. When the matter came to such a pass, it is no wonder that each Vaiṣṇava should declare himself a follower of a Sakhi, and the poets should associate themselves with the Manjaris in the colophon.

From the manuscripts that we have been able to consult, we find that the book in which there is a colophon wherein the poet associates himself with a Manjarī, is comparatively modern.

In a manuscript named Dehanirṇaya, being the Calcutta University manuscript No. 613, we have the following in the colophon—

কোস্তরি মুঞ্জরি পাদপদ্ম করি ধ্যান ।

সংক্ষেপে কহিল এই দেহের আক্ষান ॥

The manuscript is dated 1259 B. S.

In another manuscript we have—

শ্রীশুণ মঞ্জরি শুণের নিহারি অরণ জুগল জে ॥
অমুগত বিনে এ সকল কথা কারে না কহিবে ভাই ।
নরোত্তম কহে পরম জানিলে তাহারে কহিতে চাই ॥

This is from a manuscript named Deha Tattva dated 1217 B. S.

In another manuscript we find—

রসবতি রাতুল চরণ করি আশ ।
শ্রীস উজ্জল কহে জগন্নাথ দাস ॥

This is from the Calcutta University manuscript No. 598 dated 1219 B. S.

Again—

রসশূন্ত মূর্খ রসিক দাস মূঢ়মতি ।
শ্রীরূপাঙ্কুশে কহে রতি-বিলাস-পঙ্কতি ॥

From the Calcutta University manuscript No. 586 dated 1188 B. S.

Naturally it creates doubt in our mind that the books wherein we have Manjaris in the colophons were most probably written at a time not very far off. This can help us to ascertain the real author of a Pada in case of difficulty or doubt. When we have a colophon like this—

অনঙ্গ মুঞ্জরি পাদপদ্ম করি আশ ।
স্বরূপ-কল্পতরু কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

(From the Calcutta University manuscript No. 2520),

we doubt, though the manuscript is not dated, that it is the work of the celebrated Narottama Dāsa. It is not improbable that some other Narottama might have written the book.

In another manuscript No. 3098 we have—

শ্রীরূপ মঞ্জরি পাদপদ্ম করি আশ ।
চোমৎকার চন্দ্রিকা কহে নরোত্তম দাস ॥

Now, in the three manuscripts (*i.e.*, Deha Tattva noted above, and Nos. 2520, 3098), we have three Manjaris, *i.e.*, Guṇa Manjarī,

Ananga Manjarī and Rūpa Manjarī, mentioned as the spiritual guides of Narottama. It is generally seen that a poet strictly adheres to one Manjarī. When we find three of them revered by the same person we think that there is something unusual in it. It is therefore doubtful that these books were written by the same person.

Let us now turn to the Padas of Caṇḍīdāsa. In the second Pada (about তিমির আঁকার, etc.) that we have quoted towards the beginning of this discussion, we find that in two manuscripts the Pada is said to have been composed by one Kṛṣṇa Dāsa, but in the Sāhitya Pariṣad Edition of Caṇḍīdāsa, it is attributed to Caṇḍīdāsa. This naturally creates doubts in the mind as to the real authorship of the same. But the last line of the first version is this—

শ্রীকৃপ কৃপাতে

ইহা পাবে হাথে

সহজে মন রাখ বাক্য ।

In the second version quoted from the manuscript, we have the last lines omitted. But by carefully observing the text, it is not difficult to conjecture that the last two lines, as quoted above, were also in that version, which were accidentally omitted, thus leaving the couplet incomplete. In the Sāhitya Pariṣad edition we have—

কৃপ করুণাতে

পারিবে মিলিতে

যুচিবে মনের ধাক্কা ।

কহে চণ্ডীদাস

পূরিবেক আশ

তবে ত থাইবে সুখ ॥

Here also the reference to Rūpa is quite clear. Now, what is the significance of this Rūpa? If it refers to Rūpa Goswāmī, we must say that it is a forgery, for Caṇḍīdāsa lived a long time before that Vaiṣṇava saint. But if it refers to শ্রীকৃপ মঙ্গরী, it is also to be admitted that Caṇḍīdāsa is not the real author of the song, for nowhere is he accustomed to associate himself with Rūpa Manjarī in the colophon, as we have pointed out before. We have shown that such practice is comparatively modern, and can, therefore, say that the song was composed by some poet of later time, be he Kṛṣṇa Dāsa or whoever he may be, and that the song was wrongly

attributed to Caṇḍidāsa. The rhyming of the last four lines is very peculiar. There we find ধাক্কা rhyming with স্মৃধা, which is unsatisfactory. There is a clear sign of manipulation in the last four lines, as the following comparison will also show—

কুণ্ডদাস বলে	সাথে এক মীলে
• বুচায় মনের ধাক্কা ।	
শ্রীরূপ কৃপাতে	ইহা পাবে হাথে
সহজে মন রাখ বাক্কা ॥	

Manuscript Version.

Versus

রূপ করুণাতে	পারিবে মিলিতে
বুচিবে মনের ধাক্কা ।	
কহে চণ্ডীদাস	পূরিবেক আশ
তবে ত খাইবে স্মৃধা ॥	

Sāhitya Pariṣad Edition.

The first part of the second line from the end (of the manuscript version) has been grafted to the last part (সাথে এক মীলে) of the fourth line from the end, while the third line from the end has been kept practically unchanged, and thus the 4th and 3rd line from the end of the Pariṣad version have been composed. The defective rhyming is due to the incapability of the manipulator. We can thus apply a critical test to the Padas of Caṇḍidāsa. The songs, wherein we find a reference to Rūpa, or any Manjarī in the colophon, were most probably not written by Caṇḍidāsa, but were attributed to him in later time. One may conjecture that some original lines well-known to the public were preserved intact, but the interpolater introduced some propaganda by a few lines of his own, and made the whole pass in the name of Caṇḍidāsa thereby adding weight to the song. Or, it may be that when the Manjarī-cult was firmly established among the Bengali Vaiṣṇavas, some overzealous persons took up a song of Caṇḍidāsa, and introduced invocations to Rūpa and Manjarīs in the colophons

2. In Ratnasāra, Calcutta University manuscript No. 1111, we have the following—

মরিলে না জায় ছাড়া ॥

In the Sāhitya Pariṣad Edition of Caṇḍīdāsa, (song No. 385), we have—

কি তার কুল-ভয় লাগে ॥

বেদ-বিধি পর	সব অপোচর
ইহা কি জানে আনে ।	
রসে গর গর	রসের অন্তর
সেই সে মরম জানে ॥	
দুহক অধর	সুধারস বাণী
তাজে উপজিল পী ।	
হিয়ায় হিয়ায়	পরশ করিতে
তাহার তুলনা কি ॥	
কহে চণ্ডীদাস	শুন বিনোদিনী
পীরিতি রসের ভোর ।	
পীরিতি করিয়া	ছাড়িতে নারিবে
আপনি হইবে চোর ॥	

This short piece, when compared with the previous one quoted from the Calcutta University manuscript No. 1111, tells an interesting tale. The first four lines are almost similar. Then in the Pariṣad edition we have four lines, of which there is no counterpart in the other. Similarity then again begins from দুহার অধর, etc. We have here two lines almost similar, but then the text of the Pariṣad edition has been abruptly contracted. When the topic came up to the finding of the significance of the three letters composing the word পীরিতি, we cannot understand why the text should be unnecessarily contracted after dealing with the letters পী only, as has been done in the Pariṣad Edition. This is clear sign of manipulation and this also undoubtedly shows that the original text was somewhat like that quoted from the Ratnasāra where we have the significance of the three letters clearly set forth. But let us take up the song No. 379 of the Pariṣad edition of Caṇḍīdāsa—

পীরিতি বলিয়া	এ তিন আঁখর
এ তিন ভুবন-সার ।	
এই মোর মনে	হয় রাতি দিনে
ইহা বই নাহি আর ।	

বিহি এক চিতে ভাবিতে ভাবিতে
নিরমাণ কৈল পী ।

সুধার সাগরে মধন করিয়া
তাহে উপজিল রি ॥

পীরিতি-রসের সাগর গথিয়া
তাহে উপজিল তি ।

সকল সুখের এ তিন আঁখর
উপমা বলিব কি ॥

* * *

পীরিতি বন্ধন না যায় খণ্ডন
দ্বিজ চণ্ডীদাসে কয় ॥

Here—

সকল সুখের এ তিন আঁখর
উপমা বলিব কি ।

is also almost similar to

এ তিন আঁখর অতি মনহর
ইহার তুলনা কি ।

of the song quoted from the Ratnasāra, and

পীরিতি বন্ধন না যায় খণ্ডন

echoes the sense of

মরিলে না যায় ছাড়়া

of the song of Ratnasāra.

It is not improbable that a song of তরঙ্গী রমণ has been thus utilised in fragments to compose more than one song attributed to Caṇḍīdāsa. We could even conjecture that তরঙ্গী রমণ utilised the materials of more than one song of Caṇḍīdāsa to compose one in his name, had we found the significance of the three letters

পরিভি all traced in the song No. 379 quoted above. Here the contraction undoubtedly creates doubt about the authorship of Candāsa.

THE ARYABHATIYAM

Translation

BY P. C. SENGUPTA

SECTION I

Dasagitika or the Song of Ten Stanzas.

1. Having made obeisance to the True God, the Supreme Brahman who though One is also Many, Aryabhata speaks here of three things, *Ganita* or Mathematics, *Kala-kriya* or planetary motion determining time, and *Gola* or Spherics.

2. In this section the *Varga* letters are used in square places and the *Avarga* letters in non-square places in denoting numbers; the numbers are begun with *ka*, *ya* (in the units place) is equal to the sum of *ngma* and *ma* (i.e., $5 + 25 = 30$); the nine vowels are used in eighteen places both square and non-square and may be used in higher places after the ninth square place (similarly with suitable alterations).

For the sake of expressing all numbers in very compact forms, Aryabhata here invents a new alphabetic notation and in this he succeeds eminently; but the forms of the numbers meant to be committed to memory, are however too difficult to pronounce and the next ten stanzas which he meant to be sung by the learners, appear more or less like a jargon of

words and least suitable for a song. According to the scheme adopted the numbers are expressed as follows :—

The Sanskrit alphabet has twenty-five consonants which are called *Varga* letters and begin with *ka* ; it has eight *Avarga* consonants beginning with *ya*. Hence according to the notation, numbers are expressed as in the following scheme :—

Ka	Kha	Ga	Gha	ngma	cha	chha	ja	jha	na
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
T'a	T'h'a	da	dha	n'a	Ta	Tha 17 (thought)	Tha 18 (that)	Thha	na
11	12	13	14	15	16			19	20
Pa	Pha	Ba	Bha	Ma					
21	22	23	24	25					
Ya	Ra	La	Wa	Sa	Sa'	Sha	Ha		
30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		

The first twenty-five letters are called *Varga* letters ; the next eight *Avarga* letters denote the corresponding numbers only in first or unit's place, these letters in other non-square places denote only 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. The square places are of the units, hundreds, ten-thousands, etc., the non-square places, of the tens, thousands, hundred thousands, etc. The vowels take both the *Varga* and *Avarga* letters to the different square and non-square places according to their order in the alphabet thus : *a* takes a letter to the first place, *e* to the second, *u* to the third, *ri* to the fourth, *li* to the fifth, *ea* to the sixth, *eai* to the seventh, *o* to the eighth and *ou* to the ninth places. In the scheme of notation this stands like thus :—

Units	Sq. place	A
Tens	Non-sq. place	
Hundreds	Sq. place	E
Thousands	Non-sq. place	
Ten Thousands	Sq. place	U
Hundred Thousands	Non-sq. place	
Millions	Sq. place	Ri
Ten Millions	Non-sq. place	
Hundred Millions	Sq. place	Li
Thousand Millions	Non-sq. place	
Ten Thousand Millions	Sq. place	Ea
Hundred Thousand Millions	Non-sq. place	
Billions	Sq. place	Eai
Ten Billions	Non-sq. place	
Hundred Billions	Sq. place	O
Thousand Billions	Non-sq. place	
Ten Thousand Billions	Sq. place	Oa
Hundred Thousand Billions	Non-sq. place	

Examples.—The combination $khu = kh + u$; now $kha = 2$, but the application of the vowel u takes it to the third square place and means 20000; again $yu = ya + u$, $ya = 3$ and is taken to the third non-square place and denotes 300000; $Khyughri = (kha + ya)$ both affected by $u + gha$ affected by $ri = 20000 + 300000 + 40000000 = 4320000$; $chayage ye ngmu su chhlri = cha + ya + ga \times e + ya \times e + ngma \times u + sa \times u + (chha + la) \times ri$ (the sign \times being used for 'affected by')

$$= 6 + 30 + 300 + 3000 + 50000 + 700000 + 7000000 + 50000000$$

$$= 57753336.$$

3. In a Mahayuga (i.e., 4320000 years) the sun makes 4320000 revolutions, the moon 57753336, the earth 1582237500 eastward, Saturn 146564, Jupiter 364224, Mars 2296824 revolutions respectively; the revolutions of Mercury and Venus are the same as of the sun.

Here Aryabhata speaks of the apparent revolutions of planets round the earth, and definitely states that the earth makes 1582237500 rotations in a Mahayuga. These rotations representing so many sidereal days, we infer that 4320000 years consist of 1577917500 days, and we deduce the following planetary mean motions:—


Planet	Sid. Per. according to Aryabhata.	Sid. Per. Modern values.
	Days.	Days.
Moon ...	27'32166852	27'32166140
Sun ...	365'2568005	365'25686042
Mars ...	686'99974	686'9797
Jupiter ...	4332'27216	4332'586
Saturn ...	10765'92819	10759'20

4. The revolutions of the moon's apogee are 488219, of the "Sighrochchas" of Venus and Mercury respectively 70222388 and 17937020; the "Sighrochchas" of the rest have the same revolutions as the sun. Of the moon's nodes the retrograde revolutions are 232226. All these revolutions start from a Wednesday, sunrise at Lanka—the beginning of the present Kalpa, the planets starting from the beginning of the sign Mesha (Aries).

From the above stanza we gather that the moon's apogee and nodes perform one complete revolution in 3231·987079 da and 6794·749511 da. respectively, and the following are obtained from the figures of the two stanzas :—

Length of month	Aryabhata	Modern value.
Anomalistic	27·554602 da.	27·554550 da.
Draconitic	27·212425 da.	
Synodic	29·530582 da.	29·530588 da.

We are next confronted with a term "*Sighrochcha*" and let us try to understand what it means. *Uchcha* is an invisible form of time, a god who seated at his place always drags a planet towards himself, and under the later epicyclic system displaces it parallel to the line joining his place with the earth. *Uchcha* is again of two classes, the first of which is the *Mandochcha*, one producing slow motion, the apogee or the apse of the orbit, the second is the *Sighrochcha* or the one producing quick motion. As the apparent motion of a planet is quickest at the superior conjunction of an inferior planet, and at the conjunction of a superior planet, we shall assume that this *Sighra* god is in directum with the sun at such times and it is further supposed by all Indian astronomers that this god moves round the earth uniformly.



Let *ESV* be the positions of the earth, sun and Venus at a superior conjunction, let the circles concentric at *S* be

the orbits of the earth and Venus, the arrow-marks showing the directions of their respective motion ; let E_1 , V_1 be the positions of the earth and Venus after a certain number of days : let the circles having E and E_1 for the centres be the two positions of the orbit of the *Sighra god*. Looking from E_1 as the mean motion of V is the same as that of the sun, the mean position of V should coincide with S , but for the "attraction" of this *Sighra god*, the planet is seen in the direction of $E_1 V_1$, the mean planet is displaced to V_1 ; to find where our god is, through E_1 draw $E_1 U_1$ parallel to SV_1 , cutting the god's orbit at U_1 . At E , the position of the god is at U in the same line with ESV . If $E_1 S_1$ be drawn parallel to ES , it is evident that the period of the *Sighra god* round the earth is the same as the period of Venus round the sun. Similarly the period of the *Sighra god* of Mercury is the same as its sidereal period. This is borne out as follows :

	Period according to Aryabhata.	Modern Value.
Venus (<i>Sighra</i>) 	224·6981 da.	224·7028 da.
Mercury (<i>Sighra</i>) 	87·9699 da.	87·9698 da.

A similar treatment with regard to the superior planets leads us to the conclusion that their *Sighra gods* coincide with the mean positions of the sun. Hence their *Sighra gods* have the same period as the sun.

5. There are fourteen *Manus* in a *Kalpa*, the day of *Brahma* and seventy-two *Mahayugas* in a *Manu*. Of the present *Kalpa* six *Manus*, twenty-seven *Mahayugas* of the seventh *Manu* as also the three-fourths of a *Mahayuga* passed before Thursday on which the Great War of the Mahabharata ended.

In this stanza Aryabhata speaks of the time that has elapsed since the beginning of the present *Kalpa* and he first

states his measures of time. Thus a *Kalpa* = fourteen Manus and one Manu = seventy-two Mahayugas. Here he differs from Brahmagupta and the author of *Surya-Siddhanta* who make one Manu = seventy-one Mahayugas. Again Aryabhata makes the divisions of a Mahayuga all equal, which is not accepted by Brahmagupta and others. He next states the time that elapsed between the beginning of *Kalpa* and the Thursday on which the great war of the Mahabharata ended and which is the beginning of the present *Kaliyuga*. It is $6 \text{ Manus} + 27 \text{ Mahayugas} + \frac{3}{4} \text{ of Mahayuga}$, which means $459\frac{3}{4} \text{ Mahayugas} = 725447570625 \text{ days}$. If so many days are counted from a Wednesday, the last day falls on a Wednesday, the next day is Thursday, the beginning of the present *Kaliyuga*.

6. The moon's revolutions multiplied by twelve become the signs, multiplied continuously by 30, 60 and 10, become respectively degrees, minutes and the *Yojanas* of the circumference of the heavens; the earth turns through one minute in a *prana* (=4 seconds); the planets move in circles whose measures are the circumference of the heavens divided by their respective number of revolutions: the orbit of the sun is one-sixtieth of the circle of fixed stars.

In this stanza Aryabhata first speaks of the divisions of a circle into signs, degrees and minutes; he then speaks of the circumference of the heavens and thence of the orbits of the planets. The central idea is that all planets move through the same length of space in a Mahayuga, which length is equivalent to the circumference of the heavens.

The revolutions of the moon 57753336 multiplied by $12 \times 30 \times 60 \times 10$ or 216000 , become 12474720576000 which is the measure of the heavens in *Yojanas*.

Here is an attempt to represent planetary motion by equable motion along circles.

7. Eight thousand times the measure (height) of a man equals a *Yojana*, one thousand and fifty *Yojanas* measure the diameter of the earth, the diameters of the sun and the moon are respectively 4410 and 315 *Yojanas*; of the polar mountain

the diameter is 1 *Yojana* and the diameters of Venus, Jupiter, Mercury, Saturn and Mars are respectively $\frac{1}{10}$, $\frac{1}{15}$, $\frac{1}{15}$, $\frac{1}{15}$, and $\frac{1}{15}$ of the diameter of the moon, when taken at the mean distance of the sun.

The first part defines the unit *Yojana* which is here equal to 8000 times the height of a man, given in the next stanza to be 4 cubits. If we take cubit = $1\frac{1}{2}$ ft. the height of a man is 6 ft. and one *Yojana* = $9\frac{1}{11}$ miles. The diameter of the earth then becomes about 9545 miles and the radius is 4772.5 miles. Uncertainty of the unit, the height of a man renders it impossible for us to judge, if Aryabhata's estimate of the earth is fairly accurate or not. Again if the height of a man is taken at 96 finger-breadths as defined below, we find that 24 finger-breadths make nearly 17 inches, the height of a man becomes 5'-8" inches and the radius of the earth becomes 4500 miles.

We next come to the diameters of the planets, the sun's diameter is 4410 *Yojanas*; the orbit of the sun is $57753336 \times 216000 \div 4320000$ *Yojanas*; \therefore angular diameter of the sun = $\frac{4410 \times 432000}{57753336} = 32' 59'' 28''$, similarly the angular diameter of the moon = $31' 30''$

Angular diameters are thus :—

					According to Parameshwara's interpretation.
Sun	32' 59'' 28	32' 59'' 28
Moon	31' 30''	31' 30''
Venus	28' 29''	6' 18''
Jupiter	14' 14''	3' 9''
Mercury	9' 43''	2' 6''
Saturn	7' 07''	1' 34' 5
Mars	5' 66''	1' 15'' 6

Parameshwara, the Sanskrit Commentator, takes the given diameters of the planets, Venus, etc., to be at the mean distance of the moon, and according to his interpretation their apparent diameters become different. In either case the results from Aryabhata's figures are quite different from all the other writers.

8. The planets' deviation (from the equator) extend up to 24° ; the moon's extreme latitude from the ecliptic is $4\frac{1}{2}$ degrees, while those of Saturn, Jupiter, Mars are respectively 2° , 1° , $1\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ and of Venus and Mars are 2° each, man is of 96 fingers-breadths or 4 cubits.

The inclinations of planetary orbits can be written in the tabular form thus:—

	Orbital inclination according to Aryabhata.	Modern Values.
Saturn	2°	$2^\circ 30'$
Jupiter	1°	$1^\circ 18'$
Venus	2°	$3^\circ 24'$
Mars	$1^\circ 30'$	$1^\circ 51'$
Mercury	2°	7°
Moon	$4^\circ 30'$	$5^\circ 9'$

9. The first nodes (ascending) of Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn having gone 20° , 60° , 40° , 80° , 100° of longitude are now stationary: the apses of the sun and those planets are at 78° , 210° , 90° , 118° , 180° , 236° of longitude.

10. The peripheries of the *Manda* epicycle (epicycle of apsis) divided by $4\frac{1}{2}$ are, for the moon 7° , and 3° , 8° , 4° , 13° , 7° , 9° respectively for the planets in the order as stated above; similarly the peripheries of the epicycles of quick motion (epicycles of conjunction), are 9° , 16° , 53° , 59° , 30° respectively for Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus and Mercury.

11. The peripheries of the *Manda* epicycle in the 2nd and 4th quadrants of mean anomaly for the one's having

retrograde motion are 5° , 2° , 18° , 8° , 13° ; the peripheries of the epicycles of quick motion in the 2nd and 4th quadrants are 8° , 15° , 51° , 57° , 29° ; the periphery of the atmosphere is 3375 *Yojanas*.

The figures of the last two stanzas may thus be tabulated :

Peripheries of Epicycles.

	Odd quadrants,	Even quadrants.
Moon	$31^\circ 30'$	$31^\circ 30'$
Sun	$13^\circ 30'$	$13^\circ 30'$
Mercury	$34^\circ \dots$	$22^\circ 30'$
Venus	$17^\circ \dots$	$9^\circ \dots$
Mars	$58^\circ 30'$	$61^\circ \dots$
Jupiter	$31^\circ 30'$	$36^\circ 30'$
Saturn	$40^\circ 30'$	$58^\circ 30'$

Sighra Epicycles (Epicycles of Conjunction).

Saturn	$40^\circ 30'$	36°
Jupiter	72°	$67^\circ 30'$
Mars	$238^\circ 30'$	$229^\circ 30'$
Venus	$265^\circ 30'$	$256^\circ 30'$
Mercury	$139^\circ 30'$	$130^\circ 30'$

No comment is necessary just now, we shall take up the subject of Epicycles when we come to discuss planetary motion in the *Kala-kriya*.

12. 225, 224, 222, 219, 215, 210, 205, 199, 191, 183, 174, 164, 154, 143, 131, 119, 106, 93, 79, 65, 51, 37, 22, 7 are the tabular differences of the half chords expressed in minutes.

Aryabhata here gives the first differences of the sines (*i.e.* perpendiculars) of 24 angles beginning with $225'$ and increasing by $225'$ in a circle of radius— $3438'$, so that what

is here spoken of as the sine of an angle is really the sine multiplied by 3438. His figures are exhibited in a tabular form :—

Argument $R \sin \theta$,

Angle	Differences	Sines	True Values	True Differences
3° 45'	225	225	224·856	224·856
7° 30'	224	449	448·746	223·893
11° 15'	222	671	670·720	221·971
15° 0'	219	890	889·820	219·100
18° 45'	215	1105	1105·109	215·289
22° 30'	210	1315	1315·606	210·557
26° 15'	205	1520	1520·589	204·923
30° 0'	199	1719	1719·000	198·411
33° 45'	191	1910	1910·050	191·050
37° 30'	183	2093	2092·922	182·872
41° 15'	174	2267	2266·831	173·909
45° 0'	164	2431	2431·033	164·202
48° 45'	154	2585	2584·825	153·792
52° 30'	143	2728	2727·549	142·724
56° 15'	131	2859	2858·5·2	131·043
60° 0'	119	2978	2977·495	118·903
63° 45'	106	3084	3083·448	105·953
67° 30'	93	3177	3177·351	93·903
71° 15'	79	3256	3255·546	78·185
75° 0'	65	3321	3320·853	65·307
78° 45'	51	3372	3374·940	51·087
82° 30'	37	3409	3408·588	36·648
86° 15'	22	3431	3430·639	22·051
90° 0'	7	3438	3438·000	7·361

It will be seen that the Table given by Aryabhata is fairly correct, and the values agree with those given in

Surya Siddhanta. We shall take up the method of deriving the Table in the section on *Ganita* (Mathematics).

13. The above ten stanzas of aphorisms meant as a song, embody the various motions of planetary bodies within the limits of this Universe; one who is conversant in these reaches the Supreme Brahman by piercing through the spheres of planets and fixed stars

The End of Section I named the Dasagitika.

SECTION II

Ganita.

1. After having done obeisance to the Brahman, the earth, the moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn and the fixed stars, Aryabhata here speaks of the knowledge that is worshipped in Kusumpura (*i.e.*, Pataliputra).

2. Units, tens, hundreds, thousands, ten-thousands, hundred thousands, millions, ten-millions, hundred millions, and thousand millions are the notational places; each place is ten times its preceding place.

Here we have the earliest record of the use of notational places (স্থান).

3. The Square is a figure of four equal sides (which has also its diagonal equal); its area is also called a square and the product of two equal quantities is also a square. Product of three equal quantities is called a cube, which is also the name of a twelve-edged figure.

In this stanza Aryabhata does not care to give us any rules for involution as we find in Brahmagupta, Sridhara, Mahavira and Bhaskara.

4. To find the square root always divide from the non-square place by twice the square root (up to the preceding place), if the square of the quotient can be subtracted from the next square place, then this quotient laid down in the next place is the square root.

Example.—Find the square root of 10272025.

Process :—

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \begin{array}{cccc}
 \text{Sq} & \text{Sq} & \text{Sq} & \text{Sq} \\
 10 & 27 & 20 & 25
 \end{array} \left(\begin{array}{c} 3205 \\ 9 \end{array} \right. \\
 \hline
 12 \\
 2 \times 3 = 6 \left) \begin{array}{c} 12 \\ 7 \end{array} \\
 \hline
 2^2 = 4 \\
 \hline
 2 \times 32 = 64 \left) \begin{array}{c} 32 \\ 0 \end{array} \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 320 \end{array} \right. \\
 \hline
 0^2 = 0, \quad 0 \\
 \hline
 2 \times 320 = 640 \left) \begin{array}{c} 3202 \\ 3200 \end{array} \left(\begin{array}{c} 5 \\ 25 \end{array} \right. \\
 \hline
 5^2 = 25
 \end{array}$$

The first step is to mark the square and non-square places which may be done by using dots over the square places as usual. The number up to the highest square place is 10, its square root is 3 which is the first figure of the square root, the remainder 1 with 2 of the non-square place brought down makes up 12, which is divided by twice 3; the quotient is 2, its square must now be subtracted from the figure in the next square place 7 which is possible; hence the next admissible figure of the square root is 2. We have to

proceed in the same way till the last figure is exhausted.

Aryabhata here does not clearly state how to find the square root of a non-square number, but it appears likely that he followed a plan like this—

$$\sqrt{3} = \sqrt{\frac{3000000}{1000000}} = \frac{1732}{1000},$$

as is done by Sridhara and Bhaskara and all the later writers. Brahmagupta on this subject gives a definite rule which may be thus summarised :

$$\sqrt{a^2 \pm b} = a \pm \frac{b}{2a \pm \frac{b}{2a}} \quad \text{approximately}$$

According to which

$$\sqrt{3} = \sqrt{2^2 - 1} = 2 - \frac{1}{4 - \frac{1}{4}} = 2 - \frac{4}{15} = 1.7333$$

Brahma Siddhanta, XII, 34, 35.

5. To find the cube root divide from the second non-cubic place by three times the square of the cube root, and subtract from the next non-cubic place the square of the quotient multiplied by three times the previous part of the root, and also subtract the cube of the quotient from the next cubic place.

The units' place is the first cubic place, the place of tens is the first non-cubic place and the hundred's place is the second non-cubic place of the first period. Similarly thousand's place is the second cubic place, then again are the first and the second non-cubic places, etc.

Example.—Find the cube root of 34965783.

Process :—

$$\begin{array}{r}
 34965783(327 \\
 27 \\
 \hline
 3 \times 3^2 = 27 \quad 79 \quad 2 \\
 \quad \quad 54 \\
 \hline
 \quad \quad 256 \\
 2^2 \times 3 \times 3 = 36 \quad 36 \\
 \hline
 \quad \quad 2205 \\
 \quad \quad 2^2 = 8 \quad 8 \\
 \hline
 2 \times 32^2 = 2072 \quad 21977(7 \\
 \quad \quad 21504 \\
 \hline
 \quad \quad 4738 \\
 7^2 \times 3 \times 32 = 4704 \quad 4704 \\
 \hline
 \quad \quad 343 \\
 7^2 = 343 \quad 343 \\
 \hline
 \end{array}$$

\therefore the required cube root = 327.

6. The area of a triangle is its *Sarira* (body) and is equal to half the product of the base and the altitude: half the product of that (*i.e.*, the area of the base) and the height is the *Phala* (*i.e.*, the volume) of the six-edged solid (the triangular pyramid).


The second part of the rule is not correct, but strange to say that this rule was blindly followed even by Chaturveda, the Commentator of Brahma Gupta's work; *cf.* Bhaskara's Goladhyaya, III, 58-61, commentary.

7. Half the circumference multiplied by the radius is undoubtedly the area of the circle; that multiplied by its square root is the volume of the sphere without a residue.

Volume of a sphere is here given as $\pi r^2 \times \sqrt{\pi r^2} = 1.47 \times \pi r^3$ which is evidently wrong. The correct value was most probably found by Sridhara; cf. Trishatika 56.

8. In a trapezium the distance of the point of intersection of the diagonals, from one of the parallel sides, is the product of the breadth of the trapezium by the corresponding side divided by the sum of the parallel sides. The area of a trapezium is equal to the product of the breadth by half the sum of the parallel sides.

In the trapezium ABCD,
 $EF:EG = AF:GC$
 $= FB:GD$
 $= AB:CD$
 $\therefore EF:EF+EG = AB:AB+CD$
 $\therefore EF = \frac{GF \times AB}{AB+CD}$



The second part of the above stanza needs no explanation.

9. Of all figures the length and breadth (average length and average breadth are meant) should be found: the area is their product. Chord of one-sixth of the circumference is equal to radius of the circle.

The second part of the above stanza leads to the problem of squaring the circle or finding the value of π .

10. One hundred and four multiplied by eight with sixty-two thousands is the approximate circumference of a circle whose diameter is twenty thousand.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Symbolically } \pi &= \frac{62000 + 8 \times 104}{20000} \\ &= \frac{62832}{20000} = 3.1416; \end{aligned}$$

this is the most accurate value as determined by the ancients.

According to Ahmes the Egyptian

$$\pi = \left(\frac{24}{7}\right)^2 = \frac{576}{49} = 3.0864.$$

According to Archimedes, $3\frac{1}{7} > \pi > 3\frac{1}{11}$.

According to Apollonius $\pi = 3\frac{1}{12}$,

which is adopted by Ptolemy. A value 3.097, very nearly the same as that of Ahmes, is given in the Sulva-sutras. Some of the later writers Brahmagupta, Mahavira and Sridhara preferred $\sqrt{10}$ as the value of this constant to that given by Aryabhata. They probably wanted to construct a right-angled triangle whose one side is equal to the diameter, and the hypotenuse is equal to the circumference, by doing which the other side of the right-angled triangle becomes nearly equal to three times the diameter. As to the method of Aryabhata I venture to suggest the following which is supported both by Bhaskara and his commentator Ganesha.

Aryabhata most probably began with a regular inscribed hexagon and actually calculated the perimeters of the inscribed regular hexagons of 6, 12, 24, 48, 96, 192, 384 and 768 sides, and equated the perimeter of the regular polygon of 768 sides to the circumference. The results of my calculations by the above method are shown below.

Radius = 10,000.

No. of sides of inscribed regular polygon.	Perimeter.	Perimeter + Diameter.
6	$\sqrt{3600000000}$	3
12	$\sqrt{3858468371}$	3.105828
24	$\sqrt{3925344811}$	3.132629
48	$\sqrt{3942207878}$	3.139350
96	$\sqrt{3946432686}$	3.141032
192	$\sqrt{3947489454}$	3.141452
384	$\sqrt{3947736725}$	3.141550
768	$\sqrt{3947802784}$	3.141575

In the above work, if P be the perimeter of a regular polygon of n sides inscribed in a circle of radius R , the relation used is

$$P' = \sqrt{8n^2 R^2 - \sqrt{64n^2 R^2 - 16n^2 R^2 P^2}},$$

where P' is the perimeter of the regular polygon of $2n$ sides—a relation which is an easy deduction from stanza 17 of this section.

That this was really the method adopted by the Kusumapura School of Mathematicians is corroborated by Bhaskara, Goladhyaya, III, 52, commentary, and also by Ganesha, the commentator on the Lilabati of Bhaskara; *vide* Colebrooke's translation, page 87.

11. Divide a quadrant of the circumference by means of triangles and rectangles, and thus derive the desired 'sines' for any given radius.

When the chord of a given arc is known, half the chord is the sine of half the arc: to find the chord of this half arc, it is necessary to construct a right-angled triangle which will have the chord of the half arc for the hypotenuse; the new chord halved is the sine of half of the half arc; a rectangle has to be drawn for the sine of the complementary arc. Another meaning is that a quadrant is trisected by the inscribed equilateral triangle and bisected by the inscribed square; after these broad divisions the sines of desired arcs may be found. From the way in which the value of π is obtained, it is easy to see that a table of 'sines' was readily derived. *Cf.* the Panchasiddhantika, IV, 1-5; Brahmagupta, XXI, 20-23; Bhaskara's Goladhyaya, V, 1-6.

12. In the table of differences of sines (I, 12) the number by which any figure exceeds its next is equal to the quotient obtained by dividing the sum of the tabular differences from the beginning up to that figure, by the first figure of the table. By these quotients all the remaining figures of the table may be deduced.

If D^n and D^{n-1} be any two consecutive figures of the table, then

$$D_n - D_{n+1} = \frac{\sum_1^n D_n}{D_1}$$

$$\text{or } D_{n+1} = D_n - \frac{\sum_1^n D_n}{D_1} \text{ i.e.,}$$

writing out in full

$$\begin{aligned} & 3438 \sin (n+1) \alpha - 3438 \sin n \alpha \\ & = 3438 \sin n \alpha - 3438 \sin (n-1) \alpha \\ & - \frac{3438 \sin n \alpha}{225}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{i.e., } \sin (n+1) \alpha - \sin n \alpha = \sin n \alpha - \sin (n-1) \alpha$$

$$- \frac{\sin n \alpha}{225}, \text{ where } \alpha = 225'$$

If the equation be correctly deduced the true divisor comes out to be 234. It is meant to be a rule by which some sines which lie between two well known sines may be derived. The whole table cannot be accurately found even by using the quotient 234. It is further clear that the table was deduced in the right Indian way from the simple rule used in calculating the perimeters of inscribed polygons.

13. The circle is described with a pair of compasses, triangles and quadrilaterals by straight lines; ground is made level with water and the vertical is found with a plumb-line.

14. Add the square of the gnomon to the square of the shadow, the square root of the sum is the radius of the observer's sphere.

This is a very well known sphere in Indian Astronomy used in almost all the standard works, *vide* Surya-Siddhanta III, 22, 23; Brahma-Siddhanta, III, 4, and the Triprasnadhi-kara of Bhaskara's work. The observer is supposed to be at the end of the shadow. If from the bottom of the gnomon, towards north, a length equal to $h \tan \phi$ where h is the


height of the gnomon and ϕ the latitude of the station, be measured and a straight line be drawn through the point thus marked, in the east and west direction, the plane passing through the top of the gnomon and this line, represents any diurnal circle : and the distance of the end of the shadow from this line measures the sine of the amplitude, where the radius spoken of above is the radius.

15. The distance between the lamp post and the gnomon multiplied by the height of the gnomon and divided by the difference in height between the gnomon and the lamp post is the length of shadow from the bottom of the gnomon.

16. If a lamp post and two gnomons have their bottoms in the same line, the distance between the ends of the two shadows, multiplied by either shadow and divided by the difference of the two shadows, is the base, *i.e.*, the distance between the end of that shadow and the bottom of the lamp post ; that base multiplied by the height of the gnomon and divided by the shadow is the height of the lamp post.

The two gnomons are supposed to be of the same height.

AB represents the lamp post, and h, h the gnomons, S_1, S_2 the two shadows. The rule is evident from the following :—




$$\frac{Y}{x} = \frac{h}{s_1}, \quad \frac{Y}{x+d} = \frac{h}{s_2}; \quad \therefore x = \frac{ds_1}{s_2 - s_1}, \quad \text{where } x = BC, \quad CD = d$$

17. In a right-angled triangle what is the sum of the squares of the perpendicular and the base, is the square of the hypotenuse. In a circle if a chord divides it into two arcs ; the product of the two arrows of the two arcs is the square of the half chord.

The first half of the stanza gives what is known as the Pythagorean theorem which is given in the Sulva-Sutras ; the theorem was known among all the ancient civilised races, long before the time of Pythagoras. The second half treats of the circle, and is a simple case of Euclid, III, 35.

The chord AB divides the circle ABX into two arcs AYB and AXB, XOY bisects AB at right angles so that XO and OY are the two arrows. Hence $AO^2 = XO \cdot OY$. If R denotes the radius, then



$$OY (2R - OY) = AO^2$$


$$\therefore 2R \cdot OY = AO^2 + OY^2 = AY^2$$

$$\therefore AY^2 = 2R (R - \sqrt{R^2 - AO^2}),$$

from which is readily derived the relation used in calculating the perimeter of a regular polygon of $2n$ sides when the perimeter of the regular polygon of n sides is known.

18. When two circles intersect one another, the sagitta of each is obtained by multiplying the diameter of the other less the *grasha* (the breadth of the common part), by that *grasha* and by dividing the result by the sum of the diameters each diminished by the *grasha*.

Let the circles ABC and BCD intersect at B and C, let AEFD be the line bisecting the common chord BC at right angles at O ; here EF the part of AD representing the breadth of the common part, is called *grasha* or the devoured (eclipsed) portion.



$$\begin{aligned} \text{Let } OF = x \text{ ED} = d', \text{ and } EO = d = OE = y, \text{ EF} = g, \text{ AF} = d \\ \therefore BO^2 = x (d - x) = y (d' - y), \\ \therefore dx - d'y = x^2 - y^2 = (x + y) (x - y). \end{aligned}$$

Again $x + y = g$.

$$\therefore dx - d^1y = g(x - y);$$

$$\therefore \frac{x}{d^1 - g} = \frac{y}{d - g}$$

$$\text{Hence } x = \frac{g(d^1 - g)}{(d - g) + (d^1 - g)}$$

$$y = \frac{g(d - g)}{(d - g) + (d^1 - g)}$$

which is the rule.

19. In a series in Arithmetic Progression, the number of terms less one divided by two and multiplied by the common difference and finally increased by the first term is the mean value of a term: that multiplied by the number of terms is the sum of the series up to the desired number of terms; the same sum is also the sum of the first and last terms multiplied by half the number of terms.

20. When the sum of a series in A. P. is known and also the first term and the common difference, the number of terms is thus obtained: multiply the given sum by eight times the common difference and increase the product by the square of twice the first term diminished by the common difference; the square root of the result diminished by twice the first term divided by the common difference, increased by unity and finally halved is the number of terms.

If a be the first term and b the common difference, S the sum to n terms, then

$$n = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sqrt{8bS + (2a - b)^2}}{b} - 2a + 1 \right),$$

which readily follows from

$$S = \frac{n}{2} \left\{ 2a + (n - 1)b \right\}$$

21. In a series consisting of terms which are sums of natural numbers, where the differences increase by unity, the

sum is the continued product divided by six, of the three consecutive numbers of which the first represents the number of terms in the series, or which is the same thing, as the cube of that number increased by unity minus the cube root of the cube and divided by six as before.

Natural numbers are,

$$1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, \dots$$

Sums of natural numbers,

$$1, 3, 6, 10, 15, 21 \text{ etc., } \dots \frac{r(r+1)}{2},$$

The stanza says that the sum of the n terms of the second series

$$= \frac{n(n+1)(n+2)}{6} \text{ or } \frac{(n+1)^3 - (n+1)}{6}$$

22. The sum of the squares of the first n natural numbers is one-sixth of continued product of the three numbers of which the first is n , the second is $n+1$, the third is $n+1$ increased by n , the number of terms. The sum of the cubes of n natural numbers is equal to the square of the sum of n natural numbers.

Symbolically the rules are thus expressed :

$$(1) \quad 1^2 + 2^2 + 3^2 + \dots + n^2 = \frac{n(n+1)(n+1+n)}{6}$$

$$\frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{6}$$

$$(2) \quad 1^2 + 2^2 + 3^2 + \dots + n^2 = \left\{ 1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + n \right\} \\ = \left(\frac{n(n+1)}{2} \right)^2$$

23. To find the product of two numbers, from the square of their sum take away the sum of their squares, half of the result is to be known as their product.

The meaning of this stanza is rather perplexing, if it were simply

$$ab = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (a+b)^2 - a^2 - b^2 \right\}$$

as an algebraical identity there would have been some meaning. But to apply it to find the product of two numbers is to bring in a complexity where none exists.

Example.—Find the product of 2394 and 379 according to the rule: $2394 + 379 = 2773$ and we square the numbers by the elegant Indian method, *vide* Colebrooke's Translation of Lilabati.

(1)	(2)	(3)
2773	2394	379
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
4	4	9
28	12	42
28	36	54
12	16	49
49	9	126
98	54	81
42	24	
49	81	
42	72	
9	16	
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
7689529	5731236	143641

$$\begin{aligned} \text{i.e. } 2773^2 &= 7689529 \\ 2394^2 &= 5731236 \\ 379^2 &= 143641 \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore 1814652 = 2 \times 2394 \times 379$$

$$\text{Hence } 2394 \times 379 = 907326 \text{ Ans.}$$

If this be the new method of multiplication introduced by Aryabhata, we would suggest a modification which would shorten the process by one step.

$$\text{We have } ab = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ (a+b)^2 - (a-b)^2 \right\}$$

$$\text{Here } a = 2394,$$

$$\text{and } b = 379,$$

$$\therefore a + b = 2773$$

$$2773^2 = 7689529,$$

$$2015^2 = 4060225,$$

$$4 \mid 3629304$$

$$\therefore 2394 \times 379 = 907326 \text{ Ans.}$$

$$a - b = 2394 - 379 = 2015.$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 2015 \\ \hline 4 \\ 0 \\ 4 \\ 20 \\ 001 \\ 10 \\ 25 \\ \hline 4060225 \end{array}$$

It is not unlikely that the above was adopted as an alternative process of multiplication by the Kusumpura school of Indian Mathematicians.

24. Take the square root of the square of the difference increased by four times the product of two unknown quantities: the result increased and decreased by the difference and halved, are the two quantities.

This stanza gives rules for the solution of

$$x - y = a$$

$$xy = b$$

25. When the principal is equal to the rate of interest for a given sum, the amount multiplied by the given sum and time is increased by the square of half the given sum; the root of the result diminished by half the given sum and divided by the time is the rate of interest for the given sum.

Let the rate of interest per a rupees = r , principal also be r , t denote the time in years or months as the case may be, and A denote the amount, then,

$$A = r + \frac{r^2 t}{a}$$

which is a quadratic equation in r ;

$$\therefore r = \frac{1}{t} \left\{ \sqrt{Aat + \left(\frac{a}{2}\right)^2} - \frac{a}{2} \right\}$$

26. In the rule of three, the yield is multiplied by the given number and divided by the argument, the result is the yield of the given number.

27. This is a stanza of obscure import. The first half is totally unintelligible, the second half most probably speaks of reducing fractions to a common denominator.

28. In the inverse operation, the multiplier becomes the divisor and the divisor multiplier; the additive becomes subtractive and the subtractive additive.

Illustration.—What is that number which when multiplied by three, divided by five, increased by six, having the square root taken, diminished by one and finally squared, yields four?

Let x be the required number, then,

$$\left(\sqrt{\frac{3x}{5} + 6} - 1 \right)^2 = 4,$$

$$\therefore x = \{(\sqrt{4+1})^2 - 6\} \times \frac{5}{3},$$

that is in passing from 4 to x , we have first to take the square root, then *add* 1, then square the result, subtract 6, multiply by 5 and divide by 3. This is expressed as if the squaring has become taking the root, the subtractive has become additive, taking square root has become squaring, the additive has become subtractive, the divisor the multiplier and the multiplier divisor.

29. If there are a certain number of unknown quantities and all the possible sums of these quantities less one, be given : then the sum of all the quantities is equal to the sum of all the sums given divided by the number of quantities less one.

If

$$\begin{aligned} b+c+d &= S_1, \\ a+c+d &= S_2, \\ a+b+d &= S_3, \\ a+b+c &= S_4, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$a+b+c+d = \frac{S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + S_4}{4-1}.$$

30. If two persons be equally rich, the difference of their wealth in money divided by the difference in things (of equal value) is the price of each thing.

31. When two bodies are moving in opposite directions, their distance divided by the sum of their rates of motion, and when they are moving in the same direction, that distance

divided by the difference of their rates, gives the time of their meeting or the time that has elapsed since they last met.

32 and 33. These stanzas are elliptical ; the sense has been made out only after comparison with the corresponding stanzas of Brahmagupta.

To find the number which yields known remainders for any two given divisors, divide the divisor yielding the greater remainder by the divisor which yields the lesser remainder and divide mutually the successive remainders ; the last remainder is multiplied by such an assumed integer as makes the difference of the original remainders increased by the product, exactly divisible by the last divisor of mutual division ; put down the quotients one below the other followed by the assumed number and put down the new quotient last of all. Multiply the lower by the upper and add the last and continue in this operation till only two numbers are left ; take the lower of the two numbers, and divide it by the divisor yielding the less remainder ; multiply the remainder thus obtained by the divisor yielding the greater remainder and add the greater remainder. The result is the number answering to the two divisors and the two remainders.

Let a number

$$N = A\alpha + K$$

$$= B\beta + K^1$$

$$\therefore \frac{A\alpha + (K - K^1)}{B} = \beta \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad (1)$$

The problem is to find a value of N , when A, B, K and K^1 are known, K being greater than K^1 . A is here the divisor yielding the greater remainder and B the divisor yielding the less remainder. The rule directs us to divide A by B , etc.

Suppose

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 B) & A & (Q_1 \\
 & \underline{Ba_1} & \\
 & r_1) & B (Q_2 \\
 & & \underline{r_1 Q_2} \\
 & & r_2) & r_1 (Q_3 \\
 & & & \underline{r_2 Q_3} \\
 & & & r_3) & r_2 (Q_4 \\
 & & & & \underline{r_3 Q_4} \\
 & & & & r_4) & r_3 (Q_5 \\
 & & & & & \underline{r_4 Q_5} \\
 & & & & & r_5
 \end{array}$$

and also let

$$\frac{r_5 t + c}{r_5} = q \quad \text{where } c = K - K^1$$

Now

$$r_5 = r_4 Q_5 + r_4$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \therefore \frac{r_5 t + c}{r_5} &= Q_5 t + \frac{r_4 t + c}{r_4} \\
 &= Q_5 t + q = y_1 \quad \text{suppose}
 \end{aligned}$$

Again

$$r_4 = Q_4 r_3 + r_3$$

$$\therefore \frac{r_4 y_1 - c}{r_4} = Q_4 y_1 + \frac{r_3 y_1 - c}{r_3} = Q_4 y_1 + t = y_2 \quad \text{suppose}$$

Again

$$r_3 = Q_3 r_2 + r_2$$

$$\therefore \frac{r_3 y_2 + c}{r_3} = Q_3 y_2 + \frac{r_2 y_2 + c}{r_2} = Q_3 y_2 + y_1 = y_3 \quad \text{suppose}$$

Again

$$B = Q_2 r_1 + r_1$$

$$\frac{B y_3 - c}{r_1} = Q_2 y_3 + \frac{r_1 y_3 - c}{r_1} = Q_2 y_3 + y_2 = y_4 \quad \text{suppose}$$

Lastly

$$A = Q_1 B + r_1$$

$$\therefore \frac{A y_4 + c}{B} = Q_1 y_4 + \frac{r_1 y_4 + c}{B} = Q_1 y_4 + y_3 = y_5 \quad \text{suppose}$$

Hence

$$\alpha = y_4 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = y_5 \quad \text{is a solution of}$$

$$\frac{A\alpha + c}{B} = \beta$$

The value of y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_5 are deduced by the rule thus:—

Q_1	$Q_1 y_4 + y_5 = y_5$
Q_2	$Q_2 y_3 + y_5 = y_5$
Q_3	$Q_3 y_2 + y_5 = y_5$
Q_4	$Q_4 y_1 + t = y_5$
Q_5	$Q_5 t + q = y_1$
t	
q	

We are to lay down $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4, Q_5, t$ and q in a vertical column t is multiplied by Q_5 and q is added to the product, and q is rejected, then $Q_5 t + q$ is multiplied by Q_4 and t is added thus deriving y_2 . We are to go on in this way till only two numbers y_4 and y_5 are left.

It is thus seen that when a solution of

$$r_5 t + c = q$$

is known, the original equation can be solved.

Now

$$\frac{Ay_4 + C}{B} = y_5$$

$$\text{or } Ay_4 + C = By_5,$$

$$\text{and } A\alpha + C = B\beta,$$

$$\therefore A(\alpha - y_4) = B(\beta - y_5).$$

$$\therefore \frac{\alpha - y_4}{B} = \frac{\beta - y_5}{A},$$

Again

$$y_4 = Bp + \alpha_1 \text{ and } y_5 = Ap + \beta_1$$

$$\therefore \frac{\alpha - \alpha_1}{B} = \frac{\beta - \beta_1}{A}$$

or α_1 , the least positive value of α is obtained as the remainder of y_4 divided by B_1 which is the divisor yielding the less remainder.

Hence $N = A\alpha_1 + k$ according to the rule.

It is to be noted that z , the assumed integer, is to be selected after an odd number of partial quotients have been obtained, and that y , the lower of the two numbers left, is reduced by dividing it by the divisor yielding the lesser remainder. The remainder after an odd number of partial quotients may even be zero.

Example—

Solve $\frac{45x+7}{29} = y$ in the positive integers.

$\frac{45}{29} = 1 + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{4 + \frac{1}{3}}}}$, so that the remainder is zero after the partial quotient 3.

If we follow Aryabhata's rule we find for the assumed integer 5, $x=208$, $y=323$, the least positive solution is $x=5$, $y=8$.

Aryabhata's method easily led to the methods of all the subsequent writers. In all of them the rule is to proceed backward starting from the last remainder. Parameswara, the Sanskrit Commentator, has totally failed to explain the above stanzas.

The end of Section II named Ganita.

SECTION III

Kala-kriya.

1. A year consists of twelve months ; a month, 30 days ; a day, 60 Nadris ; a Nadri, sixty Binadrikas.

2. One Binadrika is equal to the time of pronouncing sixty long syllables, and is also equal to six Pranas, *i.e.*, respirations. This is the mode of dividing time ; the division of space is in the same way from a *Bhagana*, a whole circle.

TABLE OF TIME.

10 long syllables	= 1 Prana (respiration).
6 Prana	= 1 Binadri.
60 Binadris	= 1 Nadri.
60 Nadri	= 1 day.
30 days	= 1 month.
12 months	= 1 year.

1 day here = the time that the sun takes to move through one degree round the earth, such days are called *Saura* days.

TABLE OF ANGLES.

60 biliptas	= 1 lipta (minute).
60 liptas	= 1 angsa (degree).
30 angsas	= 1 sign.
12 signs	= a whole circle.
Again 1 bilipta	= 60 tatparas.

3. The difference in the number of revolutions of any two planets represents the number of their conjunctions in a Mahayuga. The revolutions of the sun and the moon added up and doubled represent the number of their *Vyatipatayogas* of these planets.

When the sun and moon have their declinations equal and of the same name, it is called a *Vyatipatayoga*; if the moon had no latitude, this aspect would take place whenever the sum of the longitudes of the sun and the moon is 180; as the moon is not so, this aspect is a matter for accurate calculation. The sun and the moon should be in opposite courses of motion, *i.e.*, if the sun has a northerly course, the moon must have the south course and *vice-versa*.

4. The revolutions of the *Uchcha* (the Apse or the Sighra) diminished by the revolutions of a planet, represent the revolutions of the true planet in the Epicycle (relative to the line joining the mean planet with the earth). The number of revolutions effected by Jupiter since the beginning of the *Kalpa*, multiplied by 12 are the years of Jupiter from Aswayuja. Aswayuja, etc., are the names of such years.

5. In a Mahayuga the number of the sun's revolutions is the same as the number of years, the number of conjunctions of the moon with the sun are the lunar (Synodic) months, the number of conjunctions of the sun with the earth is the number of civil days; the revolutions of the stars represent the sidereal days.

In a Mahayuga of 4320000 years, the	
revolution of the sun	= 4320000
revolutions of the moon	= 57753326 (Section I,3)
∴ Synodic months	= 53433336
Solar months	= 51840000
∴ additive lunar months	= 1593336
rotation of the earth	
or sidereal days	= 1582237500.
revolutions of the sun	= 4320000.
number of civil days	= 15779175000.
number of lunar days	= 1603000080.
omitted lunar days	= 25082580.

6. The lunar months in excess of the solar months are the *Adhimāsas* (or intercalary months); the lunar days diminished by the solar days are the omitted lunar days.

7. The solar year is the year of man, that multiplied by thirty is the year of the (departed) fathers, the year of fathers multiplied by 12 is a year of the gods.

8. One thousand divine years multiplied by twelve is the common cycle of all the planets; one hundred and eight of the cycles or Mahayugas is the day of Brahma, the Creator.

The next stanza is explained in various ways.

9. The first half quarter Yuga is progressive, *i.e.*, the period when longevity, physical strength, etc., of all beings go on increasing; the last half quarter Yuga is retrograde when the reverse takes place; the three middle quarter Yugas are even, the first and the last are called Dusshama periods (*i.e.*, periods of greatest variation), all these periods being determined from the position of the moon's apogee.

On this meaning Parameshwara, the last commentator says, "This meaning has got no bearing on the planetary motion." He then gives two other meanings.

9(b). The motion of bodies like the moon, her apogee, etc. (*i.e.*, planetary bodies) go on increasing during the first half of the first quarter Yuga and decrease in the last half of the last quarter Yuga and remain even during the three middle quarter Yugas; the first and the last quarter Yugas are the Dusshama portions. It is necessary to correct the mean positions of planets as the mean motions undergo changes.

9(c). This interpretation refers to the changes in the Epi-cycles of planets and the necessary correction thereto.

10. Now when sixty times sixty years and three quarter Yugas also have passed, twenty increased by three years have elapsed since my birth.

The three quarter Yugas are (1) the Krita, (2) Treta and (3) the Dwapara ages. Aryabhata was 23 years old when 3600 years of the present Kali Yuga had elapsed, *i.e.*, in 3600-3179 or 421 of the Saka era which is equivalent to 599 of the Christian era.

11. The Mahayuga, year, month and day started simultaneously from the light half of Chaitra. Time has neither beginning nor end, is estimated by means of planets and stars in the space.

Aryabhata seems to say that time is unvaried and that its variation appears only through the motion of planetary bodies.

12. In sixty solar years all planets moving in their own orbits, describe a length of path equal to the circumference of the steller sphere, and in a divine Yuga the circumference of the heavens.

13. The moon describes her smallest orbit situated beneath all the other orbits in the shortest time, the slow-goer Saturn describes his largest orbit situated above all in the longest time.

14. The signs of the Zodiac are smaller in smaller orbits, the degrees and minutes also vary in size in the same proportion being the same parts of respective orbits.

15. Beneath the stars are the planets in the order, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the sun, Venus, Mercury and the moon; beneath all these is the earth stationed at the centre of space like a tying post for all.

16. These seven beginning with Saturn are in their (increasing) order of quickness and are the lords of the hours; the fourths in order of quickness are the successive lords of the days beginning with the sunrise.

This stanza relates to some astrological terms. The lords of the successive hours are in the order of increasing quickness;—Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the sun, Venus, Mercury and the moon. Of Saturday the first hour belongs to Saturn, the second to Jupiter, third to Mars, etc.; in this way the first hour of the next day belongs to the sun, and the sun, the fourth in the above order, is the lord of the next day. In this way the days of the week belong to Saturn, the sun, the moon, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter and Venus. This sort of naming the days is quite universal and seems to be associated with the discovery of the seven planets. This explanation of determining the lords of the days of the week by Aryabhata is opposed by both Varahamihira and Brahma Gupta. (*Vide* the Pancha-Siddhantika, XV, 26-29, Brahma-Sphuta-Siddhanta, XI, 12 and 13.) Both of them call this illogical because there cannot be any one day all over the

world and they prefer to reckon time with lunar days which are dependent on the longitudes of the sun and the moon. Varaha says, "Ordinary people, as a rule, proceed in their business according to the days of the week as known from tradition." The Surya-Siddhanta explains the meaning of the day in the same way as Aryabhata (Surya-Siddhanta, XII, 78 and 75). This sort of the naming of the days of the week, as also the signs of the Zodiac, is to be ascribed to the Babylonians (see History of Astrology in the Encyclopaedia Britannica) from whom most probably both the Indians and the Greeks borrowed their astronomical as astrological knowledge.

17. All planets move in circles eccentric to the orbits which are concentric with the earth at the rates of their mean motion, in the directions of the signs of the Zodiac (eastward) from their apses and in the opposite direction from their *Sigrochchas*.

Sigrochcha is the mean place of the sun in the case of the superior planets; and in the case of the inferior planets, it is in the line through the earth drawn parallel to the line joining the sun to the mean heliocentric position of the inferior planet. This *Sinhra god* always moves faster than the mean planet. The business of an *Uchcha* (the apse or the *Sighra god*) is to drag a planet always towards itself by means of strings *made of air*, thus producing inequalities in planetary motion. This most probably was the older idea of planetary motion in ancient India, till it was replaced by the ideas of motion in eccentric circles or in epicycles and deferents. Both these ideas are woven into an incongruous whole in the modern Surya-Siddhanta; see II, 1-5, 9-10, 52; for the epicyclic construction, see II, 34-51, 53-57; see also Dasagitika, 4, Explanations of *Sighra*.


18. The eccentric circles of planets are equal to their concentrics, and the centre of the eccentric is removed from the centre of the earth.

19. The distance between the centre of the earth and the centre of the eccentric is equal to the radius of the planet's

epicycle; on the circumference of the eccentric the planet undoubtedly moves with the mean motion.

These three stanzas describe the eccentric circle idea of the solar system. The central idea was that there was no doubt that the planets described circles round the earth; if the motion were unequal, it was due to the fact that the centres of such circles did not coincide with the centre of the earth.

Let the eccentric circle A P S be the orbit of the sun relative to the earth, E the centre of the earth and C the centre of the eccentric, P and A are respectively the perigee and apogee in the same line with E and C. S moves uniformly the circle, but seen from E motion along appears uneven. Through E and S let ES_1 and SS_1 be drawn parallel to CS and CE respectively. From S draw SM perpendicular to SE. Let ECS, the mean anomaly, be denoted by θ_1 , then the angle SES is the equation of the centre and let it be denoted by ϕ .



Now $\tan \phi = \frac{p \sin \theta}{R - p \cos \theta}$, where $p = EC$ and $R = CS$,

$$\therefore \phi = \frac{p}{R} \sin \theta + \frac{p^2}{2R^2} \sin 2\theta + \frac{p^3}{3R^3} \sin 3\theta + \dots$$

which is the expression for the equation of the centre in eccentric circle, but the expression for it in elliptic motion is

$$= 2e \sin \theta + \frac{5}{4} e^2 \sin 2\theta + \frac{e^3}{12} (13 \sin 3\theta - 3 \sin \theta)$$

$$\therefore \text{if } \frac{p}{R} = 2e, \frac{p^2}{2R^2} = 2e^2,$$


which is greater than $\frac{5}{4}e^2$; hence even with a suitable value of $\frac{p}{R}$, the expression is wrong in the co-efficient of the second

power of eccentricity. Hence the laying of emphasis on the planets moving in eccentric circle is due to imperfect methods of observation that the astronomers of those times had to adopt.

Now to come to the other planets, if we suppose them to describe circles uniformly about the sun at the centre, the relative motion round the earth can be represented by eccentric circles and equally well with the help of epicycles and deferents.

In the figure let S represent the sun and the two concentric circles represent the orbits of (1) an inferior planet and (2) of the earth; let E, S, V be the position of the bodies initially so that V is at superior conjunction and let E_1, S, V_1 be their positions after a certain number of days. Now complete the parallelogram $E_1 S V_1 S'$; with centres E and S' draw two circles each having the same radius ES or $E_1 S$ and produce $E_1 S'$ cutting these circles in U and U_1 . The points U and U_1 are the *Sighra* apogees of V . Through E_1 draw $E_1 O$ parallel to ES . The mean motion of an inferior planet round the earth being the same as that of the sun, looking from E_1, S is the mean position of V and the motion of the mean planet is the general direction of planetary motion. Again as the angular motion of V is greater than that of the earth, the angle $SE_1 U$ goes on increasing, arc $U_1 V_1$ being always equal to US , looking from U_1, V_1 appears to move in the opposite direction.

In the above figure if the circle having E_1 as the centre, is the concentric the circle having S' for the centre is the



eccentric. Again if the circle having E_1 for the centre is called the deferent the real orbit of V is the epicycle. In the case of a superior planet also, the drawing of the similar parallelogram easily leads to the eccentric circle and the epicycle. Further the epicyclic idea is the more natural in the case of inferior planets and the revolving-eccentric circle idea, the more natural in the case of superior planets. It is seen that the radius of the epicycle bears the same ratio to the radius of the deferent as the mean distance of an inferior planet bears to the mean distance of the earth; also the radius of the epicycle of a superior planet has the same ratio to the radius of the deferent of the planet as the mean distance of the earth bears to the mean distance of the superior planet.

Mean Distances of Planets.

	Deduced from Aryabhata's Epicycles	Deduced from Ptolemy's Epicycles	Modern Values
Mercury	·375	·375	·3871
Venus	·7250	·7194	·7233
Earth	1·0000	1·0000	1·0000
Mars	1.5385	1·5190	1·5237
Jupiter	5·1613	5·2174	5·2028
Saturn	9·4183	9·2307	9·3389

20. The planet which moves quickest at the *Uchcha* (the highest point, the furthest distance) moves in the reverse direction in its eccentric; while the one which moves slowest at the *Uchcha* moves in the direction of the signs in its eccentric.

21. The *Manda* epicycles move in the direction of planetary motion from the apse, and the *Sighra* epicycles move in the opposite direction from the *Sighrochha*; the mean planet is at the centre of the epicycle which is on the *Kaksha* (the concentric or deferent).

The above is the only stanza in which planetary motion has been explained on the epicyclic hypothesis.

22. The sines and versed sines for calculating the equation are to be taken negative, positive, positive and negative from the apse (apogee) and they are to be taken in the reverse order from the *Sighrochchas*.

The equation of apsis is negative from the apogee to the perigee and is positive from the perigee to the apogee. The expression for the equation of apsis

$$= - \frac{\text{Periphery of the epicycle} \times R \sin (\text{mean anomaly})}{360}$$

Where

$$R = 3438_{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Aryabhata determines the 'Sine' of an arc always by the angle *passed over* in any quadrant. When the arc is less than 90° , its 'Sine' is obtained with the help of table given in the *Dasagitika*, 12; when the arc is greater than 90° but less than 180° , the versed sine of the excess of the arc over 90° subtracted from the radius gives him the desired sine thus:—

$$\text{Similarly} \quad R \sin (90^\circ + \theta) = R - R \text{ vers } \theta$$

and

$$R \sin (180^\circ + \theta) = -R \sin \theta$$

$$\begin{aligned} R \sin (270^\circ + \theta) &= -R - R \text{ vers } \theta \\ &= -R + R \text{ vers } \theta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in the expression for the equation of the centre where the signs of these functions are changed, the sine in the first quadrant is negative, the versed sine in the second is positive, the sine in the third is positive, and the 'versed sine' in the 4th is negative.

The expression for the *Sighra* equation being positive, the sines and the versed sines have the opposite signs.

23. In the case of Saturn, Jupiter and Mars, in the first operation half the equation of apsis is applied negatively or positively; to the thus corrected planet is applied half the corresponding *Sighra* equation (equation of conjunction); to then corrected mean planet is applied the whole of the corresponding equation of apsis and finally the apparent planet is

obtained by applying the whole corresponding *Sighra* equation to the last corrected mean planet.

The above rule is similar to the one given in the *Surya-Siddhanta*, II.

24. In the case of Venus and Mercury, half the *Sighra* equation is to be applied negatively and positively to the apse, then apply the equation of apsis due to the corrected apse, to the mean planet, and we have the corrected mean planet: to this must be applied the two more equations due to apsis and conjunction.

25. A stanza of obscure import.

The End of Section III, called the Kala-kriya.

SECTION IV

Gola or Spherics.

1. A half of the ecliptic from the first point of Aries to the last point of Virgo lies on the north of the equator while the other half, from the first point of Libra to the end of Pisces lies on the south.

2. The nodes of the 'star planets'—the five planets, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn—and also of the moon, move unceasingly along the ecliptic, so too does the sun; in the same circle undoubtedly moves the shadow of the earth at the distance of half a circle from the sun.

3. The moon moves north and south of the ecliptic from her nodes, Jupiter, Mars and Saturn also move in the same way from their nodes; so also move Mercury and Venus by the positions of their *Sighrochchas*.

The latitude of the moon depends on the arc between her apparent position and the position of a node. The heliocentric latitudes of other planets also depend on the difference in the heliocentric longitude of the planet and of the node. In the case of a superior planet the *Surya-Siddhanta* applies the annual parallax to the node, in the same way as it is applied to the planet's heliocentric longitude to convert it to geocentric longitude (the application of the last *Sighra phala*), thus an approximate difference in the heliocentric longitude of the planet and of the node is obtained, *Surya-Siddhanta* II, 55 56. In the case of an inferior planet the same work applies to the equation of apsis in the opposite way to the node; an approximation to the suitable arc is obtained by taking the difference of the longitudes of the corresponding *Sighra god* and the corrected node, the longitude of the *Sighra god* being the same as the mean heliocentric longitude of the inferior planet. Here *Aryabhata* also suggests the same thing. In the face of these rules it would be rash to assert that the ancient Indian

astronomers blindly adhered to the geocentric idea of planetary motion. The rules suggest that they really recognised, if not exactly, the heliocentric, at least, the Tycho Brahean idea of the planetary system.

4. When the moon's latitude is nil, she becomes heliacally visible when she is at the distance of twelve degrees from the sun, Venus at nine degrees and the others of smaller diameter in the ascending order, at distances increasing by two degrees.

The above can be tabulated as follows:—

Planet						Distance of visibility from the sun
Moon	12°
Venus	9°
Jupiter	11°
Mercury	13°
Saturn	15°
Mars	17°

The increasing order of smallness is given in section I. 7. The visibility of a planet or heavenly body by the naked eye, depends on (1) the brightness of the body, and (2) the corresponding depth of the sun below the horizon a little before sunrise or a little after sunset, according to the position of the body west or east of the sun. The brightness depends on (a) the phase of the body and (b) the diameter, (c) the distance of the body from the earth. The rule of the text is only an approximation.

5. Halves of the spherical bodies of the earth, planets and the stars are darkened by their shadows; the other halves which are presented to the sun shine according to their sizes

6. The earth which is spherical in every way, is inside the circular frame of the constellations, surrounded by the orbits of planets and is situated at the centre of the space. The body of the earth is made of earth, water, fire and air.

7. Just as the knot of the *Kadamba* flower is covered on all sides by flowerets, so is covered the sphere of the earth by all living beings either of land or water.

8. In a day of Brahma the Creator, the earth increases by one *Yojana* radially and in his night which is equal to his day, the earth undergoing a slow contraction, has an equal diminution.

9. Just as a man going east by a boat sees a stationary thing as if it is going west, so do the fixed stars appear to be going straight westward at Lanka.

10. The frame of the constellations with all the planets daily move straight westward at Lanka being thrown that way by the wind called *Prabaha* for producing their daily risings and settings.

Aryabhata is apparently contradicting his statement in the previous stanza; he seems here unable to construct a new idea of motion in place of the old equable motion of heavenly bodies which he states in sec. I, 6. It is further not impossible that this stanza has undergone drastic emendations from his commentators.

11. The *Meru*, i.e., the north polar mountain is only one *Yojana* in height, is an offshoot of the Himalayas in the centre of the celestial garden *Nandana* and is made of jewels and circular in every way.

12. The *Meru* is the heaven at the centre of the land hemisphere, the hell and the *Badabamukha* are in the water hemisphere; the immortals, the dwellers of the heaven and the mortals, the dwellers of the hell, each always consider the other as living underneath.

13. What is sunrise at Lanka is sunset at Siddhapura, is noon at Yavakoti and is midnight at Romaka.

It is now impossible to identify the four cities, Lanka, Siddhapura, Yavakoti and Romaka. They are probably four hypothetical cities on the equator dividing it into 4 equal parts.

14. Lanka is midway between the land and water hemispheres, is at one-fourth of the circumference of the earth (from the pole) and Ujjain is at one-fourth of that quadrant straight towards the north.

The latitude of Avanti is thus $22\frac{1}{2}$ degrees north, but according to Varahamihira and Brahma Gupta it is 24° ; Bhaskara however is in agreement with Aryabhata.

15. A half of the circle of constellations diminished by half the diameter of the earth, is visible by the observer, the other half increased by the semi-diameter of the earth is hidden by the earth.

According to Aryabhata the circumference of the heavens of the visible universe

$$= 57753336 \times 30 \times 60 \times 10 \times 12 \quad \text{Yojanas.}$$

\therefore the orbit of the sun

$$= \frac{57753336 \times 30 \times 60 \times 10 \times 12}{4320000} \quad \text{Yojanas.}$$

\therefore the circle of constellation

$$= 14438334 \times 12 \quad \text{Yojanas.}$$

The diameter of the earth = 1050 *Yojanas*; \therefore horizontal parallax of any point of the ecliptic

$$= \frac{472500}{7219167} \times 60 = \frac{28350000}{7219167} = 3''.626.$$

16. The gods living in the north pole see the half of the circle of constellations moving towards the left, whereas the departed in the south pole see the other half moving towards the right.

17. The gods see the sun above the horizon for half of a solar year and the departed souls in the south pole see him in the same way: the fathers living on (the other side of) the moon see the sun for the half of a lunar month and here men for half a civil day.

Here is a recognition of the fact that the same face of the moon is presented to the earth, or that her periods of rotation and revolution are the same.

18. One circle of the observer passes through the east, west, zenith and nadir which is the prime vertical; another circle passes through the north, south, zenith and nadir and is the north south circle, another circle is the one bisecting the first two circles which is the *Kshitija* or the horizon where heavenly bodies rise and set.

Here we have the rational horizon and not the apparent horizon.

19. The circle which passes through the east and west points and also the two poles of the heavens which are respectively raised and lowered from the horizon, is called *Unmandala*, the sixth hour circle, which shows the decrease and increase of the day and night.

20. The intersection of (1) the line joining east and west points, (2) the line joining the zenith and the nadir, and (3) the north and south line, is at the place where the observer is.

21. A circle which passes through the zenith, nadir, and a planet is a *Dringmandala*, a vertical circle; the *Drikshepa-mandala* is the vertical through the nonagesimal passing through a point of the horizon which is 90° west of the ascending point.


The second half of the stanza cannot be properly interpreted.

22. A light globe made of wood, perfectly spherical and of even weight all round should be turned round by the observer in the unit of time through his intelligence by means of mercury, oil and water

Here a form of clock is suggested, and seems to be similar to a hydraulic tourniquet with a regular flow of water in it, oil being used to diminish friction between parts.

23. In a half of the visible hemisphere a half circle (the meridian circle) is to be marked by means of sines of the latitude and co-latitude; the sine of the latitude is the sine of the meridian zenith distance of the sun at an equinox and is the base, and the sine of the co-latitude is the perpendicular

Let NPZQH be the semi meridian above the horizon where N is the north point, P the celestial pole, Z the zenith of the observer, O, Q the intersection of the meridian and the celestial equator and H the south point. The stanza says PR the perpendicular from P on NH = QM the perpendicular from Q on OZ; QM is the sine of the meridian zenith distance of the sun on an equinox. OM the perpendicular, when QM is the base of a right angled triangle, is the sine of the colatitude.



24. Subtract the square of the sine of any assumed declination from the square of the radius, the square root of the result is the radius of the corresponding diurnal circle north or south of the equator.

25. Take the sine of an assumed arc (of the ecliptic) from the first point of *Mesha* (Aries), multiply by it the day radius of the extreme declination of the sun and divide by the radius of the corresponding diurnal circle; the result is the sine of the time that the arc will take to rise above the horizon at Lanka.

Let ω be the extreme declination of the sun; then


$$\text{Sine of } \omega = R \sin \omega$$

$$\text{Day radius of } \omega = \sqrt{R^2 - R^2 \sin^2 \omega} = R \cos \omega.$$

Let l be the arc of the ecliptic measured from the vernal equinox and R.A. the corresponding right ascension; the rule says,

$$R \sin \text{R.A.} = \frac{R \cos \omega \times R \sin l}{R \cos \delta},$$

where δ is the declination corresponding to the longitude l . This equation readily follows from the spherical triangle γSM where γS is an arc of the ecliptic, SM the declination of S , γM the right ascension corresponding to γS , the angle $M\gamma S$ is ω . We get



$$\tan \gamma M = \cos \omega \tan \gamma S. \quad \dots (1)$$

$$\text{and } \cos \gamma M = \frac{\cos \gamma S}{\cos SM} \quad \dots (2)$$

$$\therefore \sin \gamma M = \frac{\cos \omega \sin \gamma S}{\cos SM}$$

For the Indian method of arriving at the rule, see the *Siddhanta-Siromani*, Goladhyaya, VII, 43 and also see the Papers on Hindu Mathematics and Astronomy by the translator, pages 48-49.

26. Multiply the sine of the latitude by the sine of any assumed declination and divide by the sine of the co-latitude, the result is the sine in the diurnal circle of the increase and decrease of the day and night and is called the *Kshitiya* or the earth sine.

Here the *Kujya* or the *Kshitiya*

$$= \frac{R \sin \phi \times R \sin \delta}{R \cos \phi}, \phi \text{ denoting}$$

the latitude of the observer, the *Kujya* is a sine (perpendicular) in the diurnal circle whose radius is $R \cos \delta$; if the *Kuiya* is reduced to the circle of radius R , it becomes the *Charajya* or the sine of the ascensional difference :

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore \text{Charajya} &= \frac{\text{Kujya} \times R}{R \cos \delta} \\ &= \frac{R \sin \phi \times R \sin \delta \times R}{R \cos \phi \times R \cos \delta} \end{aligned}$$

The *Charajya* is the sine of the time by which half a day differs from 6 hours. For the Indian method of deduction see my Papers, pages 53 and 54.

27. The first and the last quadrants of the ecliptic certainly rise in a quarter of a (sidereal) day diminished by the ascensional difference; the other two quadrants, in the same time increased by the same ascensional difference: the order in which the ascensional difference is applied being negative, positive, positive and negative in the four quadrants.

Aryabhata here indicates the method by which the lengths of time that the signs of the zodiac take to rise at any latitude. For detailed rules we have to go to the subsequent writers Varahamihira, Brahmagupta and others.

28. Take the sine in the diurnal circle of the time from the horizon, multiply it by the sine of co-latitude and divide by the radius; the result the sine of the sun's altitude corresponding to the part of the day elapsed or to the remainder of the day.

24. Subtract the square of the sine of any assumed declination from the square of the radius, the square root of the result is the radius of the corresponding diurnal circle north or south of the equator.

25. Take the sine of an assumed arc (of the ecliptic) from the first point of *Mesha* (Aries), multiply by it the day radius of the extreme declination of the sun and divide by the radius of the corresponding diurnal circle; the result is the sine of the time that the arc will take to rise above the horizon at Lanka.

Let ω be the extreme declination of the sun; then


$$\text{Sine of } \omega = R \sin \omega$$

$$\text{Day radius of } \omega = \sqrt{R^2 - R^2 \sin^2 \omega} = R \cos \omega.$$

Let l be the arc of the ecliptic measured from the vernal equinox and R.A. the corresponding right ascension; the rule says,

$$R \sin \text{R.A.} = \frac{R \cos \omega \times R \sin l}{R \cos \delta},$$

where δ is the declination corresponding to the longitude l . This equation readily follows from the spherical triangle γSM where γS is an arc of the ecliptic, γM the declination of S , γM the right ascension corresponding to γS , the angle $M\gamma S$ is ω . We get



$$\tan \gamma M = \cos \omega \tan \gamma S. \quad \dots (1)$$

$$\text{and } \cos \gamma M = \frac{\cos \gamma S}{\cos SM} \quad \dots (2)$$

$$\therefore \sin \gamma M = \frac{\cos \omega \sin \gamma S}{\cos SM}$$

For the Indian method of arriving at the rule, see the *Siddhanta-Siromani*, Goladhyaya, VII, 43 and also see the *Papers on Hindu Mathematics and Astronomy* by the translator, pages 48-49.

26. Multiply the sine of the latitude by the sine of any assumed declination and divide by the sine of the co-latitude, the result is the sine in the diurnal circle of the increase and decrease of the day and night and is called the *Kshitijya* or the earth sine.

Here the *Kujya* or the *Kshitijya*

$$= \frac{R \sin \phi \times R \sin \delta}{R \cos \phi}, \phi \text{ denoting}$$

the latitude of the observer, the *Kujya* is a sine (perpendicular) in the diurnal circle whose radius is $R \cos \delta$; if the *Kuiya* is reduced to the circle of radius R , it becomes the *Charajya* or the sine of the ascensional difference :

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore \text{Charajya} &= \frac{\text{Kujya} \times R}{R \cos \delta} \\ &= \frac{R \sin \phi \times R \sin \delta \times R}{R \cos \phi \times R \cos \delta} \end{aligned}$$

The *Charajya* is the sine of the time by which half a day differs from 6 hours. For the Indian method of deduction see my Papers, pages 53 and 54.

27. The first and the last quadrants of the ecliptic certainly rise in a quarter of a (sidereal) day diminished by the ascensional difference; the other two quadrants, in the same time increased by the same ascensional difference: the order in which the ascensional difference is applied being negative, positive, positive and negative in the four quadrants.

Aryabhata here indicates the method by which the lengths of time that the signs of the zodiac take to rise at any latitude. For detailed rules we have to go to the subsequent writers Varahamihira, Brahmagupta and others.

28. Take the sine in the diurnal circle of the time from the horizon, multiply it by the sine of co-latitude and divide by the radius; the result the sine of the sun's altitude corresponding to the part of the day elapsed or to the remainder of the day.

This is a very rough rule for finding the sun's altitude at any time of the day. The correct rules for finding this are given by Varahamihira, Brahmagupta and all the subsequent writers. Cf. Pancha-Siddhantika, IV, 45-47, Brahma-Siddhanta, 38-40.

The problem of finding time by altitude was first solved by Indian Astronomers, *vide* my paper "Time by Altitude in Indian Astronomy" in the Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society, Vol. XVIII, No. I. For the Indian method see my "Papers on Hindu Mathematics and Astronomy," pages 57-59.

29. Multiply the sine of the sun's altitude by the sine of the latitude and divide by the sine of the co-latitude: the result is called the sun's *Sankvagram* (*Sankutala* of later writers), which lies south of line of intersection of the diurnal circle and the horizon.

If from the position in the armillary sphere of the sun at any time of the day, a perpendicular be drawn on the horizon, the distance of the foot of this perpendicular from the line of intersection of the diurnal circle and the horizon is called the *Sankvagram* or the *Sankutalam*. This line is used in Indian astronomy in finding the equation connecting the altitude and the azimuth of the sun.

30. Multiply the sine of the sun's extreme declination by the sine of the sun's longitude and then divide by the sine of the co-latitude, the result is the *Agra* or the sine of the sun's amplitude in the eastern or western horizon.

Symbolically it means :—

$$R \sin (\text{amplitude}) = \frac{R \sin \omega \times R \sin l}{R \cos \phi}$$

where ω is the obliquity of the ecliptic, l the sun's longitude, and ϕ the latitude of the station. For the Indian method of arriving at the equation see my "Papers," pages 54 and 55.

31. When this *Agra* is less than the sine of the latitude and is north of the equator, multiply it by the sine of co-latitude and divide by the sine of the latitude. The result is the sun's altitude when the sun is on the prime vertical.

The first part of the stanza is wrong and is attacked by Brahmagupta in his *Brahma-Siddhanta*, Chapter XI, 22. The sun can cross the prime vertical only when its north declination is less than the latitude of the station.

Symbolically it means :—

$$\begin{aligned} R \sin A &= \frac{\text{Agra} \times R \cos \phi}{R \sin \phi} = \frac{R \sin w \times R \sin l \times R \cos \phi}{R \cos \phi \times R \sin \phi} \\ &= \frac{R \times R \sin \delta}{R \sin \phi}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the correct equation for the altitude of the sun in the prime vertical. For the Indian method cf. the *Triprasna-dhikara* of Bhaskara's work.

32. The sine of the sun's meridian altitude is called *Parasanku*, and the sine of the meridian zenith distance is the shadow of that *Parasanku*.

33. Multiply the sine of the zenith distance of the culminating point of the ecliptic by the sine of the amplitude of the horoscope (अशु) i.e., of the point of the ecliptic on the eastern horizon and divide the result by the radius: take the square root of the difference of the square of this result and the square of the sine of the zenith distance of the culminating point of the ecliptic; the result is the sine of the zenith distance of the nonagesimal.

The culminating point of the ecliptic, the nonagesimal and the zenith from a spherical triangle, which is here taken as a plane triangle by Aryabhatī as also by the author of the *Surya-Siddhanta*. The first part of the stanza gives correctly the rule for finding the perpendicular from the nonagesimal on the meridian plane.

34. Take the square root of the difference of the squares of the sine of the sun's zenith distance and the sine of the zenith distance of the nonagesimal, the result is the sine of the arc between the sun and the nonagesimal and is called *Dringnati*.


The sun, the nonagesimal and the zenith from a spherical triangle, which is here taken as a plane triangle by Aryabhata. This is found fault with by Brahmagupta in his *Brahma-Siddhanta*, XI, 27.

The second half of the stanza is of obscure import. In these stanzas Aryabhata aims at giving rules for finding the sun's parallax in longitude. Brahmagupta gives more accurate rules in his work, *vide* B. S. V., 3-5.

35. Multiply the sine of the latitude of the station by the latitude of the moon and divide by the sine of the co-latitude, the result is to be subtracted at the rising and to be added at the setting when the moon is north of the ecliptic and to be respectively added and subtracted when south of the ecliptic.

This is an operation called *Aksha Drik Karma*, one of the two operations known as *Drik Karma*. The word *Drik Karma* means an operation by which is found the point of the ecliptic which rises or sets simultaneously with the moon and other heavenly bodies; it is an operation by which a heavenly body is made fit for being seen simultaneously with a point of the ecliptic. The celestial co-ordinates used being the longitude and latitude, the first step is to convert the co-ordinates to polar longitude and polar latitude which is known by the name *Ayana Drik Karma* which is the *Drik Karma* on the equator. The second step is to allow for the ascensional difference due to the polar latitude and is known as the *Aksha Drik Karma*.

In the figure let PZQB be the meridian, EA the horizon, γA and AM are the longitude and latitude of M. Through P draw PMKL=perpendicular to the equator E γ Q, then MK is the polar latitude and γK is the polar longitude. When the point K is on the horizon, M having a north polar latitude has already risen. The problem



is first to find the ascensional difference produced by **MK** and secondly to subtract from rK the part of the ecliptic that rises in this time. To do the first part is to take the difference of the ascensional differences due to the declinations **LM** and **LK**, as suggested by Brahma Gupta, X, 18-19 and Bhaskara, Grahaganita, XIII, 6. A rough method of finding the ascensional difference due to **MK** is this:

When the point **L** is on the horizon, the angle **PEN** = **PN** (where **N** is the north point) = latitude of the station.

In this position the part of the diurnal circle of **K** between **K** and the horizon is thus

$$= \frac{LK \times R \sin \phi}{R \cos \phi} \text{ approximately}$$

and the corresponding ascensional difference

$$= \frac{LK \times R \sin \phi}{R \cos \phi} \times \frac{R}{R \cos LK}$$

Similarly in the same position, the corresponding part of the diurnal circle of

$$M = \frac{LM \times R \sin \phi}{R \cos \phi} \text{ approximately,}$$

and the corresponding ascensional difference

$$= \frac{LM \times R \sin \phi}{R \cos \phi} \times \frac{R}{R \cos LM}$$

\therefore ascensional difference due to **MK**

$$= \frac{LM \times R \sin \phi \times R}{R \cos \phi \times R \cos LM} - \frac{LK \times R \sin \phi \times R}{R \cos \phi \times R \cos LK}$$

Now put

$$R = R \cos LM = R \cos LK,$$

\therefore the required ascensional difference is

$$\frac{MK \times R \sin \phi}{R \cos \phi}$$

which is a part of the equator; to find the corresponding part of the ecliptic we should divide the result by $\cos \omega \times \sec^2 \delta$

40. Multiply the distance between the vertex of the shadow and the moon, by the diameter of the earth and divide by the length of the shadow, the result is the diameter of the shadow at the orbit of the moon

41. From the square of half the sum of the diameter of the obscured and the obscuring bodies, take the square of the moon's latitude; half the duration of an eclipse is obtained from the square root of the result by using the daily motions of the sun and the moon.

The correction for the parallax of the longitudes and the latitude of the moon in the case of a solar eclipse is not expressly stated. Further in the diagram of the eclipse the moon is taken for the centre as in all Indian astronomical works.

42. Diminish the radius of the shadow by the radius of the moon, from the square of the result subtract the square of the moon's latitude; the square root of the result determines half the time of total obscuration.

43. Subtract the semi-diameter of the moon from the semi-diameter of the shadow, subtract the remainder from the latitude of the moon; the result is that part of the moon which is not obscured.

44. To the square of the latitude add the square of the arc of half duration diminished by the difference of longitudes produced in any given time (from the beginning of the eclipse): square root of the result subtracted from half the sum of the diameters, is the *Grasha*, the part obscured.

45. Sine of the time before or after the noon, multiplied by the sine of the latitude and divided by the radius, is the bearing of the east direction of the equator south of the observer's east on the disc in the eastern half of sphere and north of the observers east in the western half. This is found not only for the middle of the eclipse but also for the instants preceding and following that instant by the half duration. To the above is applied the declination of the longitude of the sun and moon at the time of contact increased by 90° (the algebraic sum represents the bearing of the ecliptic from the east of the centre of the disc at that instant).

Aryabhata here speaks of the two *valanas*, the second of which is called the position angle, and his rule is almost the same as that given in the modern *Surya-Siddhanta*. For a

complete discussion *cf.*, the *valanas* of the Goladhayaya VIII 30-74 and also the commentary thereon. See also my Papers.

46. At the commencement of an eclipse, the moon becomes of a smoky colour, appears dark in a partial eclipse, becomes brown in a total obscuration also dark brown when entirely inside the shadow (*i.e.*, in a total eclipse).

47. At the contact of the circumferences of the sun and the moon, one eighth of the disc of the sun though eclipsed is not seen to be so; this is due to the extreme brightness of the sun and to the moon's circumference being also transparent.

48. For this work the sun has been determined from the conjunction of the earth (*i.e.*, the horizon) and the sun, and the moon from the conjunction of the sun and the moon; similarly all the "star planets" have been found from their conjunctions with the moon.

Aryabhata here gives us the method by which he determined the mean notions of planets. The sun, he determined by the conjunction of the horizon and the sun. The year which he gives is no doubt the sidereal year. The changing appearance of the heavens in different seasons must have led to the determination of the year by the heliacal rising of a bright star *i.e.*, by observing the time that elapses between the rising of a certain bright star and the sun at intervals of 365 and 366 days. Such a year is necessarily the sidereal year. It is needless to say that such observations are best made in winter.

The moon he determined from the conjunction of the sun and moon, *i.e.*, from the synodic month. When the year is known the sidereal month can be deduced from the equation

$$\frac{1}{\text{synodic month}} = \frac{1}{\text{sidereal month}} - \frac{1}{\text{sidereal year}}$$

This synodic month may have been determined from the mean period of the heliacal rising of the moon, or from the eclipses of the sun separated by a considerable number of years. Now to come to the other half of the stanza.

Aryabhata in the second half of the stanza says that he determined the mean notions of the star planets from their conjunctions with the moon. If we suppose the orbits of the planets to be coplanar, circular and concentric about the sun, and to be described uniformly, in the case of a superior planet starting from an instant of conjunction with the sun, the length of the r th period of conjunction is obtained in the form,

$$P + A_1 \cos \frac{\pi \{(2r+1)P-2k\}}{P'} - B_1 \cos \frac{2\pi \{(2r+1)P-2k\}}{P'} \\ + C_1 \cos \frac{3\pi \{(2r+1)P-2k\}}{P'}$$

where the first fractional period bringing in the constant k is not counted. P denotes the mean period of conjunction with the moon obtained by assuming the superior planet and the moon to be moving uniformly round the earth, P' is the synodic period of the superior planet, A_1 , B_1 , C_1 , are the constants depending on the ratio of the mean distance of the earth to the mean distance of the superior planet and on P and P' .

Now let us suppose that this length of period is repeated after a complete cycle of the harmonic terms in the r' th period then

$$\frac{\pi \{(2r+1)P-2k\}}{P'} + 2q\pi = \frac{\pi \{(2r'+1)P-2k\}}{P'}$$

where q is the least suitable integer.

$$\therefore \frac{P'}{P} = \frac{r'-r}{q}$$

Here $r'-r$ denotes the number of periods of conjunction observed between the $(r+1)$ th and the $(r'+1)$ th conjunction. For Mars P' is about 779.933 days; $P=28.453$ the first four convergents to

$$\frac{P'}{P} \text{ are } \frac{27}{1}, \frac{55}{2}, \frac{137}{5}, \frac{329}{12}.$$

Let us take the convergent $\frac{137}{5}$ for Mars, *i.e.*, take 137 periods of conjunction with the moon = 5 synodic periods of Mars. There was a conjunction of Mars with the moon on Jan. 8, 10h. 7m. G. M. T. in 1908 and the 137th conjunction fell on September 10, 8h. 45 m. G. M. T. in 1918. The number of days elapsed in these 137 periods was 3897·94305. The moon's motion in 3897·94305 days = 142·6685975 revolutions, the mean sidereal month being taken at 27·3216661 days. On deducting 137, the number of periods of conjunction with the moon, Mars' motion was 5·6685975 revolutions in 3897·94305 days, whence the deduced sidereal period of Mars became 687·62 days nearly and according to Aryabhata it is 686·99974 days, while the actual period is 686·9797 days.

In the case of inferior planets a similar treatment shows that the mean period of conjunction with the moon is equal to the synodic month, *i.e.*, the same as that of the conjunction with the sun. Hence the mean period of revolution of an inferior planet round the earth is equal to the sidereal year. It thus appears that the method of Aryabhata has a sound theory to back it.

49. Thus from the ocean of true and eroneous knowledge has been raised by me with the help of the boat of my own intelligence, the precious jewel of true knowledge which so long lay sunk therein.

50. The same science which was always true and went by the name of *Shvayambhuva* (Brahma-Śiddhanta) is now published under the name of *Aryabhatiyam*. Loss of religious merit and longevity will be the share of the person who will vilify it by malicious criticisms.

The End of Section IV, named the Gola.

NOTE ON THE LIBRARY OF ABDUR RAHIM KHAN
KHANAN, THE FIRST PRIME MINISTER
OF THE EMPEROR AKBAR

BY

SHAMSUL-ULAMA HAFIZ NAZIR AHMAD KHAN SAHIB,
*Assistant Curator, Archaeological Section, Indian Museum,
Calcutta.*

Islamic history teems with illustrations of patronage of learning and erudition. In energy, clime and country, persons of light and leading, professing the Islamic faith, have endeavoured to preserve the torch of learning from extinction. Learning has always been one of the main planks in the platform of the Islamic faith, and may be likened to a centrifugal force for religious propaganda. Learning flourished *pari passu* with religion, a statement applicable with particular cogency to Islam. From the very dawn of the faith, learning travelled from the deserts of Madina, and took an eccentric but firm course through many lands shedding its lustre, specially in Europe, then in gross literary darkness. By degrees the torch of Islamic learning was carried to India where it consumed in its flames much of the prevailing sophistry. From the Hindu Kush to Cape Comorin learning, based on Islamic principles and under Islamic patronage, spread with great vigour, and learned men, encouraged by kings and potentates, founded schools, colleges and libraries. History teems with names of Ulamas who flourished in different periods of Islamic Sovereignty in India.

Here we are concerned with the Moghal period and specially with the reign of Akbar the Great, in whose time

lived the great patron of learning, Abdur Rahim Khan Khanan. He cultivated and patronised learning with great ardour, and all educational movements received his warm support. Language would fail me to describe his personal virtues. I am here only concerned with his love of learning which induced him to establish a library replete with valuable works in the collection of which he spared neither pains nor money.

The valuable library of the Khan Khanan was situated at Ahmadabad, Gujrat. It contained many valuable, rare and interesting works on every subject, and distinguished persons of Akbar's Court were attached to it. It was well managed by a large staff who corrected manuscripts, completed unfinished ones, illuminated and gilded them. Among these mention may be made of the following:—

(1) Shaikh Abdus Salem of Bahraich whose father was the famous Bhaka poet Barhami. When he was leaving India for a pilgrimage, he placed his son Abdus Salam under the guardianship of the Khán Khánán, by whom he was brought up in the library and subsequently appointed the Darughah of the Institution.

(2) Shujá a native of Shiráz. He was expert in Naskh and Suls calligraphy. In A. H. 999=1590 A. D. he had the honour of being introduced in the Darbar of Khán Khánán at Tattah and ultimately was appointed one of the officers of the library.

(3) Mulla Abdur Rahím, entitled 'Anbarín Qalam عنبرین قلم was inhabitant of Hirát. He was expert in Naskh and Nastáliq. When he appeared in the Darbar, he received the special favour of the Khán Khánán. Many of the manuscripts in the library were due to his penmanship.

(4) Muhammad Amín Khurāsání was a famous gilder. He served for a long time in the library at Mashhad, when Khurásán was occupied by the Uzbaks. He came to the Court of Khan Khanan and was given an appointment in

the library on Rs. 4,000 a month. Abri paper was his invention.

(5) Mulla Md. Husain was an expert in binding. He worked in the Khán Khánán's library for 35 years, and was still in charge when Abdul Baqi was writing the Maásir-i-Rahimi مائثرحیمی. There were several others, such as the artists Mír Baqi Mawaraun Nahri, Mulla Mushfiq, Mádhú and Bahbud Mirza Baqir who combined the arts of painting and calligraphy.

(6) Mádhú was a Hindú. He was unparalleled in photography and portrait-painting. Most of the books of the library were his own preparation.

Maulaná Şúfí was a profoundly learned man. He was also employed in the library.

In 1025 A. H.=1616 A. D. Mulla Mohammad 'Alí Kashmíri was appointed to translate an Arabic book of Kháwja Sáínuddín into Persian, and he executed this translation with great merit and ability. And he dedicated the preface to the illustrious name of Khán Khánán, and in its return, Khán Khánán offered much reward and gift.

In 1022 A. H.=1613 A. D. Naziri Níshápúrí accepted service under Khán Khánán at Āgra, and presented his Diwān (Poetical works) to his library.

The draft of Khája Hossain Khorāsāni and the first and second (couplets), composed by the said Mullá Abdur Rahím, were in this library, which Sanā'i had sent to the library for correction.

The Musnawí of Muhtashim Káshí, which had been written by Amir Mu'izzuddín Md. Káshí, the calligrapher, and in the copy of which a lac of rupees had been defrayed, that Musnawí was also in this library.

'Urfí, too, at the time of his death, presented the drafts or writings of his poems to this library, and Khán Khánán himself amended it which is now available in markets.

This library also possessed the verses of Núruddín Mohammad Zahúrí.

Md. Sharif Waqūw'í, a learned and ready poet of Nishápúr Khorásán, died in 1012, A. H.=1603 A. D. A few couplets composed by him in praise of Khán Khánán, were preserved in this library.

Saójí Surfí was a great poet of 'Iráq. A few qasidas composed by him in praise of Khán Khánán were present in the library. Mullá Shikabí was also employed here. He wrote a Musnawí on the victory of Thuth as a reward for which he received a thousand gold coins from Khán Khánán. In the same way the writings of other poets were preserved in this library, but their mention will only take time and space.

(7) We do not know how large this library was and how many books it contained. Its chief characteristic was that it contained a very large number of works written by their distinguished authors themselves, such are the works of Mulla Naziri Nishapúrí, Khenaja Husain Sanaí, Mulla Zahuri, Md. Sharif Waqúí Nishapuri, Sarfí Sáwjí, Muhtasham Káshí, etc. The works of the famous Persian poet Urfí, which were lying disarranged in this library, were arranged by the Khán Khánán in their present form. Abdul Báqí mentions about 95 learned men who enjoyed the Khán Khánán's favour in various ways, and many scholars used to study in the library.

That the Khán Khánán was an ardent admirer of learning and had a wonderful taste for collecting valuable and interesting manuscripts, has been brought home to me by the fact that almost all the famous libraries in India, which I have had the honour to visit, contain some manuscripts bearing the autograph notes of the Khán Khánán, and evidently once belonged to his own library. The following deserve notice :—

(1) A splendid copy of the Quran Sharif, beautifully illuminated at the beginning. I acquired it from Delhi for

the Government collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. It contains two notes, one in the beginning of the manuscript, by Md. Salih, the distinguished calligrapher of Sháhjahán, and the other at the end, by the Khán Khánán, explaining the ways of interpreting omens from the Quran.

(2) A very valuable copy of the well known religious tract of the celebrated saint Abdulláh Ansári, containing notes written by the two Mughal Emperors, Jabángir, Sháh-jahan, and one by the Khán Khánán himself. It has acquired an additional value by the fact that it was written by the famous calligrapher, Sután Ali Mushhadi in A.H. 921 = 1515 A.D. The manuscript is in the library of Rampore.

(3) A Persian work on the lines of the great mystics and of some celebrated lovers, by Sultán Husain bin Sultán Husain Báiqra who died in A.H. 911 = 1505 A.D. The manuscript contains 52 beautiful miniatures in the Persian style. This contains an autograph note of the Khán Khánán. This also is in the Rampúr library.

(4) A very interesting manuscript on the interpretation of dreams by Abú Raihán Andalúsí. From the autograph notes of the Khán Khánán it appears that this manuscript was presented to his father Bairám Khán by the Emperor Akbar in the 24th year of his reign. The manuscript is in the Āsafiyah library, Hyderabad, Deccan.

(5) A very valuable manuscript containing the six resalas of Sa'dí Shírází. It contains autographs of the Emperor Shahjahán and of the Khán Khánán. It is written in a very beautiful, minute and clear Nastáliq by Baqir, son of Mir Ali, the distinguished calligrapher. It is dated A.H. 1019. This is in the O. P. Library, Bankipur.

(6) A very valuable copy of Yusuf Zulaikha, transcribed by the famous calligrapher Mir Ali of Hirat, dated the end of Ramzan A.H. 930. From the magnificent appearance and the exquisite decorations of the manuscript as well as from the name of the calligrapher, it can be concluded that

this copy of Yusuf Zulaikha is no other than the one worth 1,000 muhars which was presented to Jahangir by the Khán Khánán on Monday the 2nd of Muharram A. H. 1019 = 1610 A.D. at Akbarabad of which there is reference in Maasir-i-Jahangiri. This is also at Bankipur library.

(7) The famous Urdú prose writer, Shamsul-'Ulamā Md. Husain Azād in his Darbar Akbarī in the description of Hakim Abul Fath Gilānī says that he saw a valuable and old copy of Qámūs which bears 14 seals of the libraries of the Mughal Emperors, Jahāngír, Shahjahan and others, and that in the beginning there was an autograph note in Arabic of the said Hakím that the manuscript was presented to him by the Khán Khánán.

THE NYĀYA DOCTRINE OF PRAMĀNA.

BY

SATIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI, M.A.

Section I.—The problem

The Nyāya system is primarily concerned with the conditions of correct thinking and the means of acquiring a true knowledge of objects.¹ It lays down the rules and the methods that are essentially necessary for a clear and precise understanding of all the materials of our knowledge, as derived from sense perception and authoritative statements.² With this end in view, the Nyāya system deals with all the means and conditions that are involved, either directly or indirectly, in the attempt at a correct and consistent knowledge of reality. That this is so is clearly evidenced by the use of the word 'Ānviksiki' as synonym for the Nyāya Philosophy.³ The name 'Ānviksiki' literally means the science of the processes and the methods of a reasoned and

¹ प्रमाणैरर्थपरिच्छेदं न्यायः । Vātsyāyana-Bhāṣhya on Nyāya Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

समस्तप्रमाणव्यापारादर्शाधिगति न्याय इति । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika on Sutra 1, Ad. 1.

² प्रत्यक्षागमाश्रितमनुमानम् । Vātsyāyana-Bhāṣhya on Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1. Here the word 'Anumānam' is significant. It does not mean all inferences as such, whether supported by valid grounds or not. Far from this, it stands only for the inference proper, as supported by valid grounds, as completely reasoned out and thoroughly consistent. It thus corresponds to 'Manan' or reflection which is laid down in the Vedas as the second stage, preparatory to the attainment of liberation. Cf. Sankara-Bhāṣhya on the Brihadāranyaka Upanishad : पञ्चमन्त्रव्यस्तर्कतः ।

³ “आन्विकिकौ तर्कविद्या” । Amarakosa.

साल्कीचा । Vātsyāyana-Bhāṣya on Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

सिधमानौचिकौ न्यायतर्कादिशब्देरपि व्यवह्रियते । Visvanātha, Nyāya-Sutra-Vṛitti on Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

systematic knowledge of objects posterior to a general understanding of them on the basis of perception and testimony.¹ In other words, it is the science of an analytic and reflective knowledge of objects, subsequent to a less reflective and less analytical knowledge, in which the subject of knowledge is more receptive than critical. Accordingly Nyāya may be described as the science of all the methods and conditions of valid thought and the consistent conception of objects. It should however be remembered here that the epistemological problem as to the means and conditions of valid knowledge, is not the sole nor the ultimate end of the Nyāya Philosophy.² Its ultimate end, like that of the other systems of Indian Philosophy, is liberation, the summum bonum, which is conceived by Gotama as a state of perfect freedom from pain and pleasure alike.³ To this ultimate end *viz.*, the summum bonum, a true knowledge of objects is the subservient and conducive means. It is therefore quite natural and reasonable that the question as to means and conditions of true knowledge should find an important place in any complete system of philosophy. In the Nyāya system this logical question has the most important place, and a

¹ प्रत्यक्षगमनादानीयतयात्मीयवचनमीया, तथा प्रवर्तत इत्यात्मीयको न्यायविद्या न्यायशास्त्रम् ।

Vātsyāyana-Bhāṣya on Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

अप्रवादानु पञ्चादीया अनीया, उन्नयनमहिर्वाहिका ।

Visvanātha, Nyāya-Sutra-Vritti on Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

² The distinction between Nyāya on the one hand, and the Nyāya system or the Nyāya Philosophy on the other is apt to be lost sight of and much confusion has arisen from such oversight. Nyāya as such is the science of correct thinking and may thus be said to be the same as Logic. In this sense Nyāya is designated in India by such terms as Nyāya-Sāstra, Tarka-Sāstra, etc. But the logical question is only a part, though the most important part of Gotama's system which is designated as the Nyāya system or the Nyāya Philosophy (Nyāya Darsana). Originally the name of Nyāya was applied even to Purva-mīmāṃsa which is actually called Nyāya in such works as Mādhava Āchārya's Nyāyamālā-Vistāra, and Apodeva's Nyāya-Prakāśa.

³ Vide Nyāya-Sutras 1 & 22, An. 1, Ad. 1.

greater amount of space has been allowed to it than in any of the other systems of Indian Philosophy.¹

But an epistemological enquiry into the conditions of correct thinking and valid conception of objects logically presupposes an investigation into the nature and character of truth and validity as such. What then is the characteristic mark of truth, the measure of true knowledge, the standard of validity? This question and the attempt to answer it are matters of very great interest in the Nyāya system by virtue of the depth and comprehensiveness of the Naiyāikas' enquiry in this connection. It is just the question as to the nature of *Pramāna* or the ground and source of true knowledge,—a question that stands face to face with us in any complete epistemological investigation and calls for some sort of solution.

It is a matter of historical interest to note here that, among other things, the question as to the nature and the validity of *Pramāna* or the means of knowledge was most strongly suggested to the Nyāya philosophers by the Buddhists and other sceptical thinkers of ancient India in the course of the latter's destructive criticism on Gotama's sutras and Vātsyāyana's commentary.² These sceptical

¹ In what esteem Nyāya or logic was held by the Naiyāikas will be evident from the following among other compliments paid to it by many of them. Vātsyāyana in his commentary quotes the following from Kautilya's *Arthashastra* to show that it is the light of all knowledge, the means of all actions and the abode of all virtues :

“इदं पः सर्वविद्यानामुपायः सर्वकर्मणाम् ।

अथ यः सर्वकर्मणां विदोद्देशं प्रकौर्त्तिता ॥”

So also Visvanātha says that *Pramāna*, being one of the thousand names of the Lord Vishnu, the very utterance of the word is auspicious, and that it reveals equally the conduct of gods, men and lower animals.

² This is clear from the opening lines of Udyotakara's *Vārttika*, in which it is stated that the object of Udyotakara's work is to remove the ignorance of the calumniators of Gotama's teaching, even though it was well explained by the great commentator, Vātsyāyana. Cf.

thinkers set at naught the whole of Gotama's teaching as an advice to do what is impossible like the one to procure the *Laksaka's* crest jewel which is certainly inaccessible to living men. Gotama in his writings, teaches that the summum bonum is to be attained by means of right knowledge of the sixteen categories.¹ But a right knowledge of objects depends on the knowledge of the nature and validity of the *Pramāna* or the means of knowledge in question.² A *pramāna* or source of knowledge cannot be said to give us a true knowledge of objects unless we have already assured ourselves of the efficacy and validity of that source. To say that our knowledge is true we must prove that it is really so and not the contrary. To this end we are to show that the knowledge in question is derived from a valid source of knowledge, which reveals its object and is always accompanied by it. But then, how are we to know the validity of that source of knowledge? From the nature of the case the task is an impossible intellectual feat which

यद्वचपादः प्रवरो सुनीनां प्रमाय शान्त्वं जगती जगद ।

कृतार्थिकाज्ञाननिवृत्तिहेतुः करिष्यते तस्य मया निबन्धः ॥”

Udotakara, Nyāya-Vārtika.

Vāchस्पति in explaining the above lines mentions the name of Dignāga, the great Buddhist logician, as one of the calumniators of Gotama.

Cf. “यद्यपि भाष्यकृता कृतव्याख्यानमेतत् तथापि दिङ्नागप्रभतिरर्वाचीनैः कुहेतुसन्तमससमुत्पादनेन व्याख्यादितं शास्त्रं न तत्त्वनिर्णयाय पर्याप्तमित्युद्घोषितकरणेन स्वनिबन्धोद्घोषितेन तदपनीयत इति.”

Vāchस्पति Misra in his *Tātpariyatikā* has himself given a full and clear account of all the difficulties raised by the Bouddha critics in connection with the question of *Pramāna*. Vide Vāchस्पति Misra's *Tātpariyatikā*, page 3 ff.

Dr. S. C. Vidyābhūṣana has very well pointed out the particular points in Vātsyāyana's commentary that were criticised by Dignāga and subsequently defended by Udyotakara and Vāchस्पति. Vide Dr. S. C. Vidyābhūṣana's *History of the Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*, Book II, Ch. II, § 45. and his article on Vātsyāyana in the *Indian Antiquary*, 1915.

¹ प्रमाण-प्रमेय...नियमस्थानानां तत्त्वज्ञानाद्भिः श्रेयसाधिगमः । Nyūya Sūtra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

² प्रमेयादीनां साक्ष्यदार्ढ्यानां तत्त्वज्ञानं प्रमाणतत्त्वज्ञानाधीनम् ।

no one can perform.¹ Thus the validity of knowledge must be cognised either by itself or by some other knowledge.² But the first alternative, namely, that knowledge cognises its own validity by itself, is not admissible. Knowledge cognises objects that are distinct from and outside of itself. It does not cognise itself as an object, and far less its own validity.³ The second alternative, namely, that the validity of a knowledge is apprehended by some other knowledge is not more fortunate. This second knowledge can at best cognise the first only as a fact of knowledge but not as one having a true correspondence to its object.⁴ Moreover the second act of knowledge, in whatever form it may arise, itself lacks in evidence of its validity by itself and, as such, it can never lend the same to the first knowledge. Or, if it be held that the validity of the second knowledge is self-established, there is none who dares deny the same sort of self-evidence in the case of the first.⁵ But it has been already proved that the validity of knowledge cannot be self-cognised. Now if by such arguments the validity of knowledge is placed beyond the range of proof and apprehension even, there cannot be the least doubt that the validity of the sources of knowledge, namely, the sense-organs etc., is beyond all evidence. The value and worth of a source of knowledge are to be known from the validity of the knowledge arising out of it, so that if the validity of the latter is unknowable, that of former, namely, the source

¹ नहि प्रमाणं तत्त्वानावधारितं बाधकत्वमात्रेण स्वगोचरावधारणायालम् ।... अपितु बोधकत्वेकार्थ-
समवेतेनाव्यभिचारित्वेन । तदेव हि प्रमाणम् तस्यावधारणम् । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² तथा हि विज्ञानस्य तावत्प्रामाण्यं स्वतो वा निश्चीयते परतो वा ।

Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

³ न खलु विज्ञानमनात्मसंवेदनमात्मानमपि गृह्णानि प्रागेव तत्प्रामाण्यम् ।

⁴ नापि विज्ञानाकरम् । तद्विज्ञानमित्येव गृह्णीयात् पुनरव्याव्यभिचारित्वम् ।

Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

⁵ तच्च सर्वं स्वतोऽनवधारितप्रामाण्यमाकुलं सत्कथं पूर्वं प्रवर्त्तकं ज्ञानमनाकुलयेत् । स्वतो वाऽस्य
प्रामाण्ये किमपराधं प्रवर्त्तकज्ञानेन येन तद्विज्ञापि तन्न स्यात् ।

of knowledge, is much more unknowable.¹ Therefore the irresistible conclusion, as drawn by Gotama's critics, is that the Nyāya Philosophy cannot lead to liberation through a true knowledge of the sixteen topics beginning with *Pramāna*.

Section 2.—The definition of *Pramāna*

It was with the object of meeting the above difficulties and justifying Gotama's teaching as against his opponents that Vātsyāyana in his commentary first entered on a critical consideration of the nature of *Pramāna* or the source of valid knowledge. In this Vātsyāyana was followed in the main by such Nyāya-philosophers as Udyotakara, Vāchaspati,² Udayana and others who explained Vātsyāyana's views more fully and discussed many side-issues arising out of it. Speaking broadly, the Naiyāikas were concerned with two main

¹ यदा च संवेदनप्रामाण्यमुन्नेन क्रमिण दुःखिगमं तदा कैव कथेन्द्रियादीनामन्यमिचारिसंवेदनकार्य-
व्यङ्ग्यप्रमाणभावानाम् । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² Vāchaspati, like Udyotakara, states in the opening lines of his Tātparyatikā that in this book he wants to have the merit of releasing the very old teaching of Udyotakara from the deep mud of misinterpretation. (cf.

“इच्छामि किमपि पुण्यं दुस्तरकुलिवन्धपङ्कमयानाम् ।

उद्घोतकरगदीनामतिजरतीनाम समुत्तरणम् ॥

Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

Mahāmahapadhyāya Gangādhara Śāstri says in his introduction to the Tātparyatikā that it has not been ascertained what or by whom the work, vilifying Udyotakara's Vārtika, was composed. My investigations on this point, however, go to show that it was a work entitled 'Pramāna-Vārtika' by Dharmakīrti who, after Dignāga, made the bold attempt to refute the Naiyāikas and establish the Buddhist Logic. Dr. S. C. Vidyabhusana also says that the Brahmanic logician, Udyotakara is attacked by Dharmakīrti (*vide* his History of the Mediaeval School of Indian Logic, Book II, Ch. II, § 81). It is also suggestive to note in this connection that Vāchaspati in his Bhāmatī quotes Dharmakīrti in order to criticise him. (cf. Vāchaspati's Bhāmatī on Vedāntasūtra 28, Pāda 2, Ad. 2.

issues at this stage of their epistemological investigation. The first issue was based on the nature and definition of *pramāna*, and was stated in the form of the question : what is a *pramāna* or means of knowledge ?¹ The second issue, which is more important, was drawn with regard to the determination and ascertainment of *pramāna*. Here the question is : wherein lies the validity of a *pramāna* or source of knowledge and how are we to ascertain its validity ? Let us now consider these two questions one by one.

The first question then is : What is *pramāna* or source of knowledge ? What is the characteristic mark and distinctive feature that differentiate a true means of knowledge from false ones or from other facts and factors of knowledge ? To this the *Mimāmsakas* reply that a *pramāna* or means of knowledge is that which cognises an object not so long cognised or known. In short, a *pramāna* is the cogniser of an uncognised or unknown object.² A *pramāna* is a means with regard to the end of knowledge and a means is that which must not be the same as the end in question but must directly realise the end by its activity. Hence just as an axe is the means with regard to the end of cutting a tree, not yet hewn, so the senses etc., are *pramāna* when brought to bear on objects not yet cognised or known.³ If the objects be already known or cognised, then there can be no necessity for using any means whatever for a knowledge or cognition of them. Hence a means of knowledge

¹ *Of.* किं पुनः प्रमाणास्य प्रमाणात् किञ्चीत्तं प्रमाणादिति ।

Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārtika.

² Vāchaspati states the *Mimāmsaka* definition of *pramāna* thus : अनभिगतार्थमन्तुं प्रमाणादिति । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

³ प्रमाणां हि करणविशेषः करणं च साधकतमम् ।...तथाऽप्रमिते विषये व्याप्तिनाचमिन्द्रियादिकं प्रमाणादिति लौकिकः । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

प्रमाणात्मन्यप्रमित एव विषये व्याप्तिनाचं प्रमाणादिति भाषा इत्यर्थः । Vardhamānupādhyāya, Nyāya-nibandha-prakāśa.

or *pramāna* must cognise objects that have not been previously known or cognised.

Here the *Naiyaikas* point out that the *Mimāmsaka* definition of *pramāna* lacks preciseness, and does not allow the width of scope that is properly due to *pramāna*. It excludes many facts that are cognisable and are actually cognised by a *pramāna* or source of knowledge. Eternal objects, such as soul, God, etc., cannot be said to be wholly unknown to finite persons like us.¹ Somehow or other we have an *apriori* knowledge of these objects, whatever may be the degree of clearness and distinctness of such knowledge. Nevertheless these objects may well be better cognised and known by us by such means of knowledge as perception, inference, etc. But on the *Mimāmsaka* definition these can never be the objects of a *pramāna* or source of knowledge. Further many of our cognitions of the finite and non-eternal objects of the empirical world are cognitions of what were previously known or cognised.² These are not so much simple cognitions of reality as recognition of its nature and attributes. To deny this is to ignore the psychical phenomenon of recognition, which no amount of psychological analysis has the power to accomplish.

The *Mimāmsaka* definition obviously fails in the case of continuous consciousness, in which the same thing, that was previously cognised, stands as the object of all the waves of that continuous stream of consciousness. Here all the states of consciousness, which are subsequent to the first and which constitute the continuous stream together with it, have an object that has been previously known by the first state of consciousness. Hence the *Mimāmsaka* definition of *pramāna*, as that which cognises an uncognised object, is inapplicable to the all but the first state of conscious-

¹ नित्यपदार्थेष्वनधिगतत्वं नाम नास्ति ।

² अनित्येष्वपि प्रायश्च उपलब्धानामधीपलक्षणात् । Udayanāchārya, *Parisuddhi*.

ness and so deprives them of the merit of being valid states of knowledge.¹ But no intelligent person has ever denied their validity, nor can there be any good ground for such denial. It cannot be urged that the subsequent states of consciousness apprehend different objects in so far as they occur at different moments and their objects at different moments, though ostensibly the same, are really different objects. The minute difference of time in the continuous apprehension of the same object is psychologically null, inasmuch as we have not any cognition of such inappreciable variation in time.² Hence in so far as a psychological analysis of the continuous consciousness of an object is concerned, it is to be conceded that the same object is cognised by the first and the subsequent states of consciousness. On the other hand, the subsequent states of consciousness lack none of the marks of the first and the valid conscious state. The full compass of the validity of a state of knowledge covers three facts, namely, first, a presentation of the object, next the activity of the conscious subject in response to the presentation, and finally the fulfilment of subject's activity in relation to the object. But these three facts are inseparably bound up with one another, so that with the presentation of the object, there follow the relation of the subject and the fulfilment of his activity, either by way of attainment or by that of avoidance of the object. Now all the states in the continuous consciousness of an object share equally in the function of presenting the object and, for that very reason, in those of evoking subjective reaction and its fulfilment. Hence there is no reason why, as the Mimāṃsaka-view will lead us to suppose, the first state alone is to

¹ 'अनविगतार्थगन्तु' च धारावाहिकवित्तानामधिगतार्थगोचराणां लोकसिद्धप्रमाणभावानां प्रामाण्यं विद्वन्तीति नाद्रियामहे ।

² परमसूत्राणां कालकलादिभेदानां पिशितलोचनेरव्याहरेणकलनान् ।

Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

be recognised as valid to the exclusion of the subsequent ones.¹

Next, the Naiyāikas proceed to examine the Baudhdha view of *pramāṇa*. One definition of *pramāṇa*, as given by the Sarvāstitvavādins, namely the Sautrāntikas and the Vaivāśikas, is that a state of consciousness becomes valid when it has the same form as the object cognised by it.² The proper function of a *pramāṇa* or source of knowledge is to give a true cognition of its object. But that gives us a true cognition of the object which determines the cognition in question in the same form and order in which the object exists.³ The sense-organs, however, which are generally supposed to be the means of knowledge, do not determine our cognitions to be of the same form as the objects cognised by them. The cognition of blue colour is not certainly due to the action of the eyes, for the same eyes are operative even in the cognition of colours other than the blue. It is the form of blue in the object that determines our cognition to be a cognition of blue colour. Hence the form of the object being impressed on our consciousness gives the same form to it, and thereby reveals the object itself as having that form. The form of the object therefore is the *pramāṇa* or source of our knowledge of the object, inasmuch as it is object's form that determines the object as well as our consciousness of it one way or the other.⁴ The form of

¹ तच्चादर्शप्रदर्शनसमस्यापारम्येव ज्ञानं प्रवर्तकं प्रापकं च । प्रदर्शनं च पूर्ववदुत्तरैवानपि विज्ञानानामभिप्रेतमिति कथं पूर्वमेव प्रमाणं नीतिराप्यसि । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² Vāchaspati Misra states the Boudhdha definition thus: विषयसादृश्यं साकारस्य विज्ञानस्येत्यस्ये । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

³ प्रमाणमपि तदेव यदर्थं व्यवस्थापयति । अर्थमपि तदेव व्यवस्थापयति । अर्थमपि तदेव व्यवस्थापयति, यदर्थप्रतीतिं तदीयतया नियमयति । Udayanāchārya, Tātparyaparisuddhi.

⁴ नक्षेत्रादिभिर्ज्ञानं करणैर्ज्ञानं तदीयतया नियम्यते । नहि चक्षुषा जनितत्वादेव नीलस्य नीलज्ञानं, पीतज्ञानस्यापि तथात्व प्रसङ्गात् अपि तु नीलाकारत्वादेव नीलज्ञानं नीलस्य । तच्चादर्शकार एव बुद्धिजनोद्भिः तदीयतया व्यवस्थापयन्नर्थमपि तथा व्यवस्थापयति तत्तत्तार्थव्यवस्थापनहेतुत्वात् स एव प्रमाणम् । Udayanāchārya, Tātparya-Parisuddhi.

the object is thus both the cause and the effect, the means and the end of the processes of knowledge. But there is no contradiction or inconsistency in the same thing being both the means and the end. For here the end is only the means in the process of its activity and operation.' The axe in contact with a tree 'is, by virtue of the process of contact, called the instrument. The contact of the tree with the axe is conditioned by the process of conjunction between the two. But the process of conjunction is no other than the axe in actual contact with the tree. Similarly in the sphere of knowledge a particular tree may be known as having the nature of a *Siṃsapā*-tree. Here the 'nature of a *Siṃsapā* tree' is the mark or means of our discriminative knowledge of the particular tree in question. But the tree is no other than a *Siṃsapā* and the *Siṃsapā* is no other than the tree in question, so that the means and the end are one and the same thing.

The *Vijnānavādi*-Bouddhas, namely, the *Yogāchāras* and some of the *Vaiṣṇikas*, give a different definition of *pramāna* or the source of knowledge. According to them, *pramāna* is the capacity of the intellect, which is itself devoid of forms, to manifest itself by itself. It is the power of self-manifestation in the formless intellect.² A *pramāna* is that which

¹ न चाभिप्रायानि कारणफलभावे विरुद्धानि । स हि व्यापारव्यापारिभावे वा गम्यगमकभावे वा ।... वाचे च इवे शिष्यपया गम्यमाने दृष्ट एव । न हि शिष्यपातः कश्चिदस्यो हर्षो नाम । इत्यादा शिष्यपा ।... इति सीवान्तिकाः । *Udayanāchārya*, *Parisuddhi*.

² विज्ञानस्वैवानाकारस्यात्मनात्मप्रकाशनसामर्थ्यमित्यपरे । *Vāchaspati*, *Tātparyatikā*. Here the word 'अपरे' 'others' evidently refers to the *Yogāchāra* school of Buddhists, which advocates the theory of idealism par excellence. As it will be found below, *Udayanāchārya* in his *Parisuddhi* refers to the '*Vaiṣṇikas*, etc.' as advocating the above view of *pramāna*. But *Mādhavāchārya* in his *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* mentions the theory of subjective idealism as the peculiar doctrine of the *Yogāchāra* school. Hence I take the compound 'वैभाषिकादयः' in *Udayanāchārya*'s *Parisuddhi* as including the *Yogāchāras* and some of the *Vaiṣṇikas* who, as is well known, differ from the *Yogāchāras* in their metaphysics, but may possibly agree with them in their conception of *pramāna*. Cf. Foot-note 1, p. 26.

manifests objects, but manifestation is a psychical phenomenon and, as such, can belong only to that which is intelligent and conscious. The sense-organs, however, being non-intelligent and unconscious, cannot serve the purpose of intellectual manifestation. Hence the intellect itself is to be recognised as *pramāna* by virtue of its intelligent nature and its capacity for conscious manifestation.¹ This intellect has neither any subject underlying it as its permanent substratum nor objects, external to and independent of itself. As there are no objects, external to and outside of our consciousness, consciousness itself is to be regarded as manifesting itself and the so-called objects from within itself. The series of external objects is never real, but is only set up by our imagination for the sake of practical activity, due to the influence of the beginningless *Vāsanā* or desire that is inherent in every finite mind and on the extirpation of which final release is attained.² As there are no objects or perceptible other than the intellect, the intellect itself is to be recognised as manifesting itself and as its own perceptible, luminous with its own light, like light.³ The intellect then is both the *pramāna* or source and the *pramā* or resulting product of the process of knowledge, since it is the cause of manifestation as well as the object manifested in knowledge.

Here the Naiyāikas point out that the Bouddha definitions of *pramāna*, given above, are not only incorrect but even absurd. The Sautrāntika view that the form of the object is *pramāna* because it determines our cognition in the same

¹ अर्थप्रकाशनं हि यस्य व्यापारस्तदेव प्रमाणं, प्रकाशनं च चेतन्यरूपं तस्यैव यथेत्यते...तस्माद्विज्ञानमेव चेतनतया दर्शनव्यापारतया च प्रमाणम् । ...भाषिकादयः । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

² वस्तुतो वेद्यवेदकाकारविधुराया अपि बुद्धेर्व्यवहर्तृपरिज्ञानानुरोधेन विभिन्नयास्त्रयाहकाकाररूपवत्तया... अनाद्युपपन्नवासनासामर्थ्याद्यवस्थोपपत्तेः... ।

³ तस्मात्स्वव्यतिरिक्तयास्त्रविरहानदादिका बुद्धिः स्वयमेव स्वात्मप्रकाशिका प्रकाशवदिति । Mādhavāchārya, Sarvadarsana-Samgraha, Chapter on Bouddha Philosophy.

form, this view cannot be understood in any intelligible sense. It cannot mean that the form produces itself as the form of the cognition, for the same thing cannot act as a productive cause in relation to itself.¹ Nor can it mean that the form reveals its cognition. The form being identical with the cognition cannot require a second act of knowledge for its cognition or manifestation.² Nor can it mean that the form distinguishes its cognition and thereby gives rise to a discriminative knowledge of it. The form and the cognition which has that form are identical, and for that very reason, the one cannot discriminate the other. The law of discrimination requires that the discriminator must be different from the thing discriminated and must have that thing as its object. When I discriminate a blue colour what happens is that I stand over against and as different from the colour which stands out as the object of my discriminative activity. Every act of discrimination takes place in this form, so that the self-same thing cannot be both the discriminator and the thing discriminated.³ For the same reasons the Vijñānavādin's definition of pramāna, as the power of self-manifestation in the formless intellect, cannot be accepted as tenable. A capacity or power is always a capacity or power to do something. But self-manifestation, being inherent in the very nature of the intellect, cannot be said to be the effect or to be something produced by any power or capacity.⁴ In short, the pramāna being the means of knowledge cannot at the same time be regarded as the resulting product of it. In the Bouddha definitions, however,

¹ न तावत् तदीयतया नियतां प्रतीतिं जनयन्, स्वस्मिन् स्वक्रियाविरोधात् ।

² नापि ज्ञापयन् स्वामीभूतप्रतीतिं प्रति ज्ञानान्तराजननात् । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

³ नापि निशययन्, आकारतद्वैतकत्वेन व्यावृत्त्योद्येकनिश्चयीचरत्वेन निश्चयनिश्चयकालनियमानुपपत्तेः । नीलमङ्गं जानामीत्याकारनिश्चयो न चातोऽपरः तदीयतानिश्चयो नाम । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

⁴ शक्तेः शक्यनिष्ठत्वात् । शक्यं च कार्यमुच्यते । प्रकाशनं चारम्भतत्वात् तस्याः कार्यमिति । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

the same form or intellect is considered to be the cause and the effect, the means as well as the end of the process of knowledge, which is quite absurd and impossible too.¹

Now we come to the Naiyāika conception of *pramāna*. The word *pramāna* is derived from the root 'mā' meaning knowledge, with the prefix 'Pra' meaning valid or true, and the suffix 'Anat' used to signify means or origin, so that *pramāna* derivatively signifies the means or source of valid knowledge. According to the Nyāya-philosophers, a *pramāna* is that which gives us a certain knowledge of objects.² Without the help of *pramāna* there cannot be any valid knowledge of things. A subject arrives at a valid cognition of objects by means of *pramāna*, for the existence and the nature of objects are to be ascertained only by such cognitions as are based on *pramāna*.³ A *pramāna* then is the cause of valid knowledge of objects, inasmuch as it gives us a cognition of objects just as they really are or exist in themselves.⁴ To put it otherwise, a *pramāna* is the means of valid cognition and, as such, is always accompanied by a true representation of the objects with which it is concerned. Hence a *pramāna* or means of knowledge must have a real and an invariable correspondence with its object in the sense that the essence and the attributes of the object, as revealed by *pramāna*, are uncontradictorily true of it, despite all

¹ हेतुयद्द्वयं सादृश्यशक्तौः फलादिभिर्नयोरपाकरणान् हेतुहेतुमहावस्य तादात्म्येऽनुपपत्तेरिति ।
Vāchaspati Misra. Tātparyatikā.

² प्रमाणतत्त्वार्थप्रतिपत्ते । Nyāya sūtra 29. An. 2, Ad. 4.

³ प्रमाणमन्तरेण नार्थप्रतिपत्तिः । स(प्रमाता) येनार्थं प्रमिषीति तत् प्रमाणम् । यदस्ति यथा च, तत् सर्वं प्रमाणत उपलब्ध्या सिध्यति । Vātsyāyanabhāṣya on Nyāya sūtras 1, An. 1, Ad., 1, and 29, An. 2, Ad. 4.

⁴ उपलब्धिहेतुः प्रमाणं उपलब्धिहेतुत्वं प्रमाणत्वं यदुपलब्धिनिमित्तं तत् प्रमाणमिति । तदुपलब्धिहेतुत्वं प्रमाणत्वं प्रमाणतत्त्वार्थप्रतिपत्तिः तच्च प्रमाणम् । प्रमाणं तावदर्थपरिच्छेदकम् । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārtikam. Compare also : सम्यग्गुणवसाधनं प्रमाणम् । Bhāsarvajña, Nyāyasāra. सम्यग्व्यभिचारि योऽसावनुमती वस्तुपरिच्छेदः...तस्य साधनम् । Jayasimha, Nyāya-tātparyadipikā. तच्च प्रमितिउपलब्धिज्ञानं येन ज्ञानेन, तज्ज्ञानम्यजनकं कारणं प्रमाणम् । “अर्थोपलब्धिहेतुः स्यात्प्रमाणम्” । Gunaratna, Tarkarahasyadipikā, Chapter on the Nyāya-Philosophy.

variations in time, place and other conditions.¹ In other words, a pramāna is the means of valid knowledge, since it is found to correspond to its object by virtue of the fact that it produces a real and consistent cognition of that object.² Hence it has been said that pramāna establishes all objects just as they are and thereby gives us a valid knowledge of things.³

To sum up these various statements on the nature of pramāna we may say that a pramāna or source of knowledge is that which produces a cognitive knowledge of objects and is in perfect accord with the real nature and relations of the things so cognised.⁴ Pramāna then is first the originative condition of cognition or certain knowledge of the objects with which it is concerned. It is the conceptual determinant, the *ratio cognoscendi* in relation to an object of knowledge. Secondly, pramāna is in perfect harmony with the real nature and relation of its object. That is, an act of knowledge, when based on the right pramāna, so represents the essence and attributes of its object as to make its correspondence to the object free from conflict and contradiction amidst all changes of time, place and other conditions. In short, there is a perfect and an invariable correspondence between our cognitions due to a pramāna, on the one hand, and the nature and attributes of the objects cognised, on the other.

The above definition of pramāna has been made more explicit by bringing out the distinction between pramāna

¹ उपलब्धिसाधनमिति उक्ताः । प्रमाणम् । अर्थवदिति । नित्ययोगेनतत् । नित्यता चाव्यभिचारिता तेनार्थाव्यभिचारोत्थः । इयमेव चार्थाव्यभिचारिता प्रमाणस्य यद्वा शकालान्तरावस्थान्तराविरोधादौऽर्थस्य प्रमाणादर्थोक्तदुपदर्शितयोः । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² प्रमाणं हि प्रमाकारणं...साधकतमत्वलक्षणमव्यभिचारित्वमेव कारणत्वम्, प्रमासाविपरीतोपलब्धिः, ततोऽपिपरीतागुणवजनकत्वलक्षणमव्यभिचारित्वमेव प्रमाण्यामित्यर्थः । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

³ प्रमाणास्य सकलपदार्थव्यवस्थापकत्वम् । तत् कारणत्वम् (अनुभवज्ञानकरणत्वं) प्रमाणत्वम् । Visvanāth, Nyāya-Sūtra-Vṛitti

⁴ अर्थाद्योगेनतः प्रमा तत्साधकं च प्रमावमिति... । Udayanāchārya, Tātparyā-Parisuddhi.

and certain other sources of knowledge, which are not real *pramāna*. Such forms of knowledge as uncertain or doubtful cognitions (*Samsaya*) and opposed or contradictory apprehension (*Viparyāsa*) cannot be regarded as arising from a real *pramāna* or valid source of knowledge. In a real *pramāna* there is true correspondence between our cognitions and their objects. But in doubt and contradictory knowledge we do not apprehend objects just as they really are in themselves and cannot, for that reason, successfully act upon the ideas derived from such knowledge.¹ Hence although there be cognitive knowledge in doubtful and contradictory apprehensions their sources cannot be called *pramāna* in so far as such apprehensions have no true correspondence to the nature and relation of their objects.

Similarly the causes of dream-consciousness and memory are to be distinguished from *pramāna* or the source of valid knowledge. In dream-consciousness the knowledge, we have of certain objects, has the character of cognition by force of the intensity and vividness of the presentations produced in it. There is also an occasional or accidental correspondence between our dream-cognitions and the objects of the real world outside us. Still dream-consciousness cannot be called a form of valid knowledge inasmuch as there is no uniform and invariable concomitance between the states of the dream-consciousness and their objects. Hence the cause of the dream-consciousness cannot be called *pramāna* which is to produce such cognitive knowledge as has a real and an invariable correspondence with its objects.

As to the ground of memory it is rather difficult to exclude it from the list of *pramānas* recognised by the *Nyāya*-

¹ न च संशयविपर्यासव्योपलब्धिकारणयोः प्रसङ्गः अर्थवदित्यधिकारात् । तयोर्व्योपदर्शितार्थव्यभिचारिणामर्थकत्वात् । न खलु विकल्पमानं वस्तु अर्थक्रियासु व्योपयुज्यते । *Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.*

यतो न प्राप्यतेऽत एव नार्थक्रियासु व्युज्यते, अप्राप्तेरनुपयोगाच्च नास्तीत्यर्थः । *Udayanāchārya, Tātparya-Parisuddhi.*

philosophers. In memory we have a revival of our past experiences, in the form of ideas and images, in the same order and relation in which they were actually experienced by us at a certain point of past time. The ground or condition of this revival is of course the latent impressions left by our past experiences and retained by the mind. Memory, being thus grounded on the impressions of past experiences, is, through the medium of such impressions, connected with the objects of experience.¹ Nevertheless the ground of memory cannot be called pramāna. In memory we have not really any cognitive knowledge of objects, but only a recognition of them in the same form and order in which they once existed in the past and have now ceased to exist.² Hence there is no correspondence between the conscious states in memory and the objects remembered by them as existing in a certain form and order in the past. That form or order is now past and therefore no longer real, so that there cannot be any correspondence between these and the conscious ideas by which they are remembered. Even where the same object is first cognised and then remembered, so that memory and cognition refer to the same object and are equally true, we are to observe that the act of memory borrows its validity from the state of cognition which produces and fashions it.³ Hence the usage of mankind is to distinguish between memory and valid cognition, and to understand by the latter such definite and certain cognitive knowledge as

¹ न ज्ञासीनोपलब्धिदुः न चार्थसङ्कारि प्रमाणमिति संस्कारस्यार्थसङ्कारिविरुद्धाप्रामाण्यमिति सांप्रतम् । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² ज्ञानं चावानुभवो विवक्षितः, तेन स्मृतिकरणे नातिव्याप्तिः । Visvanāth, Nyāyasutra-Vṛitti on Sutra 3, An. 1, Ad. 1. Cf. अरण्यज्ञानव्यवच्छेदार्थमनुभवयद्वयम् । Bhāsarvajña Nyāya-sara.

³ न हि यादृशोऽर्थोऽर्थते यदा तादृश एवासी तदा, पूर्वावस्थाया वर्तमाने निवृत्तत्वात् । अनुभवकाले तस्यार्थस्य तावदवस्थात् स्मृतिकाले तदादवस्थात् ।... न तु अर्थमाचार्यसदानो तदवस्थः तस्मात् स्मृतिरयथादेव । यद्यानुभवं तु भवेत् । तद्यानुभवस्य यथार्थत्वात् तदेकविषया स्मृतिरपि यथार्थेत्युच्यते ।... तस्मात् स्मृतेर्यथार्थं याचितकमखण्डनप्रायं नाज्ञानिकम् । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

is other than memory and is in perfect correspondence with its object. Pramāṇa is the source of such cognitive knowledge and not the ground of memory or recognition.¹ From all this it appears that a pramāṇa, according to the older Naiyāikas must be the source or the originating ground of certain cognitive knowledge that has a true and an invariable correspondence with the essence and attributes of its objects.

Section 3.—The Ascertainment of Pramāṇa.

Now we pass on to the next important question with regard to investigations into the nature of pramāṇa. A pramāṇa, as we have seen above, is the means of such cognitive knowledge of objects that has a true correspondence with the essence and attributes of the objects known. But here the question arises : How are we to ascertain that there is true correspondence between the act of knowledge, due to a pramāṇa, on the one hand, and the objects known by means of it, on the other ? What light is there to show that a pramāṇa is really accompanied by a true representation of the objects known by means of it ? The answer to this question will give us the Naiyāikas' method of ascertainment of the validity of pramāṇa. According to them, a pramāṇa is the means of a right cognition of objects, and it is known to give us a right cognition by virtue of the fact that it leads to a successful reaction on the part of the subject who has that cognition. Without the help of pramāṇa we cannot have a true and certain knowledge of objects, and without such true knowledge there cannot be any fruitful action or successful practice on the part of the subject of knowledge. A subject knows certain objects through a pramāṇa or source of knowledge. This knowledge of objects sets up

¹ लोकाय संस्कारमात्रजन्य कृतेरन्यामुपलब्धिमर्थोक्त्यभिप्रायिणी प्रमाणावष्टे तस्यावष्टेः प्रमाणाविति न कृतिहेतौ प्रसङ्गः । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā. कृतेरन्यस्यानुभवत्वैकनियतं यथार्थत्वमेव प्रमा-पदस्य प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तं लोकोऽवधारितवान् । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

certain psycho-physical reactions in the subject, which are directed either to obtain or to avoid those objects. The success of these reactions, their producing the desired result, *viz.*, the avoidance or the attainment of objects, is a strong evidence in favour of a real correspondence between the act of knowledge and the objects known through it.¹ It is indeed true that men often act on mistaken ideas and cognitions with the belief that their ideas and cognitions are quite valid and based on a *pramāna* proper. The reason for this confusion between a true *pramāna* and a false one, is the common characteristic that is to be found in both of them. A faulty *pramāna* leads to a general apprehension of objects as well as a valid source of knowledge does and is, for that reason, taken for a valid *pramāna* to all intents and purposes. But in such cases what distinguishes a valid *pramāna* from the contrary is the fruition of our practical activities. A valid *pramāna* gives us a true knowledge of objects and through such knowledge, leads to successful actions on the part of the knowing subject. An invalid *pramāna*, on the other hand, gives us a knowledge of objects indeed, but it cannot inspire fruitful actions in the subject of such knowledge. The activity of a subject who acts on cognitions, produced by a true *pramāna*, is successful in the sense that it terminates in the attainment of the subject's desired object or in the avoidance of such objects that are injurious to and therefore disliked by the subject. Contrariwise, the activity of a subject who proceeds on wrong cognitions, due to a false *pramāna*, fails to attain the desired object or to shun the undesired one in relation to him.² Our cognitions must

¹ प्रमाणतोऽर्थप्रतिपत्तौ प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यादर्थवत् प्रमाणम् । प्रमाणमन्तरेण नार्थप्रतिपत्तिः । नार्थप्रतिपत्ति-
मन्तरेण प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यम् । प्रमायेन खल्वयं ज्ञाताऽर्थमुपलभ्य तमर्थमभीप्सति जिज्ञासति वा । तस्मिन्साजिज्ञासा-
प्रवृत्तस्य समीक्षा प्रवृत्तिरित्युच्यते, सामर्थ्यं पुनरस्याः फलेनाभिसम्बन्धः । Vātsyāyana-Bhāṣhya.
प्रवृत्तिर्वाग्बुद्धिं शरीरारम्भ इति । Nyāya-sutra 17. An. 1, Ad. 1.

² प्रमाणं तावदर्थपरिच्छेदकं प्रमाणसामान्यात् प्रमाणप्रतिरूपकमपि प्रमाणमित्युपचर्यते । किं पुनः
प्रमाणसामान्यं प्रमाणाभासस्य सामान्यपरिच्छेदकम्...सोऽयं प्रमाता यदा प्रमायेनावधार्यं प्रवर्तते तदास्य प्रवृत्तिः

therefore be true, *i.e.*, must truly correspond to their objects in order that, on the basis of such cognitions, we may act successfully in relation to the cognised objects. If our knowledge do not really correspond to its objects, then it can never produce fruitful reactions on the part of a subject who acts upon the ideas derived from such knowledge. In cases of illusion, hallucination and the like, our actions fail to realise our ends because in such cases our ideas and impressions do not really correspond to the objects in question, whereas a valid inference, based on sure and un-failing grounds, always leads to a true knowledge of objects and, through it, to many useful and efficacious activities in our life.¹ Hence it is concluded that the successfulness of practical activities, on the part of the subject who has a right cognition of objects through a certain *pramāna* or source of knowledge, is evidence enough for there being actual correspondence between the objects on the one hand and the cognition and its source on the other.

The above method of ascertaining the validity of *pramāna* holds good so long as we are concerned with the empirical world and the finite and temporal ends or goods of life, that may be experienced by us. In the case of such empirical objects we may very well see for ourselves whether a *pramāna* is productive of fruitful actions or not and therefore

समर्था भवति यदा पुनः प्रमाणाभासिनार्थसवधार्यं प्रवर्त्तते तदाऽसमर्था । इष्टसाक्षात्मीति प्रवर्त्तमानो यदा प्राप्नोति तदा समर्था । अनिष्टं ह्यास्यामीति प्रवर्त्तमानो यदा जहाति तदा समर्था यदा विपर्ययस्तदाऽसमर्थेति ।
Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārtika on Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

¹ प्रमाणम् । अर्थवदिति । ...अत्र हेतुः प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यात् । समर्थप्रवृत्तिजनकत्वात् । यदि पुनरेतदर्थ-
ब्रह्माभिव्यञ्जकं समर्था प्रवृत्तिसमर्थकत्वात् यथा प्रमाणाभास इति व्यतिरेकी हेतुः । अन्यव्यतिरेकी वा ।
अनुमानस्य स्वतः प्रमाणतयाऽन्वयस्यापि संभवात् । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā on Sutra 1,
An. 1, Ad. 1.

प्रमाणं हि समर्थप्रवृत्तिजनकत्वादनुमेयं, तद्वान्वयव्यतिरेकानुमेयमिति । Udayanāchārya,
Tātparya-parisuddhi.

Cf. यत् न प्रमाणं भवति तत् सम्यगनुभवसाधनं न भवति । यथा रंश्यादि-सम्यगनुभवसाधनं
चेदम् । तस्मात् प्रमाणमेवेति । Jayasinha, Nyāya-tātparya-dīpikā.

valid or otherwise, since the fruits thereof are within the range of our experience and may thus be tasted by us in this world and in this life. But the Vedas as well as many systems of Indian Philosophy embody ample references to many supersensible objects, states and goods that cannot be experienced by us in this life, with its usual organs of experience and knowledge. What then is the criterion of validity with regard to our knowledge of such supersensible objects? How in such cases are we to ascertain that our knowledge springs from a valid pramāna, seeing that the fruits hereof cannot be objects of our experience and that the test of 'fruitful reactions' is inapplicable?

To this the Naiyāikas answer that it is by means of a valid analogical argument, based on points of essential similarity or identity of origin. The Vedas come from the same source as the sciences of medicine, namely, the verbal testimony of the Rishis or the enlightened seers. But the medical sciences refer to empirical goods of life, so that their validity may be proved by the test of 'successful action.' The medical sciences originate from a valid source in so far as they lead to successful activities on the part of those who act in accordance with their injunctions. But the Vedas too come from essentially the same valid source and as such are known to be valid, even though the general test of validity, namely, 'fruitful action,' be not applicable to them within the range of our present experience.¹ Hence the validity of our knowledge of supersensible objects is known from its essential resemblance to such other knowledge that proves its validity by the capacity to produce 'fruitful reactions' on the part of the knowing subject.

But another difficulty crops up here in connection with the above method of ascertaining the validity of pramāna.

¹ एवं च दृष्टार्थमन्तायुर्वेदप्रामाण्यं प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्येनावधार्यं तज्जातीयरूपादृष्टार्थस्य वेदस्य विनाऽपि प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यं प्रामाण्यावधारणमाप्तौ क्लेशः । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā, Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

A *pramāna* is known to be valid when it produces fruitful activities through a right cognition of objects on the part of the subject of the knowledge. But it may be asked here : How do we know that our activities are really fruitful, that they do realise our desired ends, or, that the fruit of our activity is really present and not illusorily imagined by us to be such ? The cognition of water on the part of a thirsty man produces the bodily movements necessary for reaching and drinking the requisite quantity of water. With this there is in him a feeling of the alleviation of thirst and the desire for water is removed. But who knows that the feeling is not illusory, that the satisfaction of the desire for water is real and not a freak of the imagination ? Do not men pass through the same series of experiences in the state of dream ? Certainly in dream-consciousness a man has a feeling of satisfied desire, preceded by a feeling of want, a desire for that which would remove the want, and an experience of the attainment of that desired object. In truth, however, the feeling of satisfaction is here as much delusive as any other deceptive product of fancy. How these are we to distinguish—a true feeling of satisfied desire from a false one, or, how can we know that the cognition of fruit in the matter of ‘fruitful reaction’ is valid and accurate ?

In reply to this question it has been said by certain thinkers that the knowledge of fruit does not require any examination. What we are to examine in the matter of ‘fruitful’ reaction is the validity of the means, the efficacy of the antecedent conditions that lead to the realisation of the fruit. The knowledge of the fruit however requires no criticism. The fruit is always some good end and, as such, the consciousness of it is a good and desirable state for the subject, no matter whether such consciousness is valid or not.¹

¹ न च फलज्ञानं परीक्ष्यते प्रेक्षावद्भिः तस्य यादृशतादृशस्याभीष्टत्वादित्यस्यचत्वाच्च फलस्य तत्साधनत्वं ते परीक्षन्ते ।...कश्चित् । Vāchaspati, Tātpariyatikā.

The Naiyāikas, on the other hand, do not rest content with the assumption of validity in any fact of knowledge, however minute or desirable it may be. According to them, even the consciousness of fruit requires to be validated by good grounds and satisfactory reasons. The consciousness of fruit has validity when it occurs as the experience of the normal healthy man and is in harmony with the established order of our previous experience. The man in whom there is a consciousness of fruit following on a right cognition of object by means of pramāna, is possessed of a good knowledge of the marks of valid cognition, as revealed by the standing order of his past experience. Hence if his present experience of fruit occurs as a fact of his normal and healthy mind, it is to be known as valid and faithful by reason of its essential resemblance to like experiences in the past order of his and his fellow beings' lives. In short the present experience of fruit is known to be valid because it is essentially of the same character as our past and valid experiences of fruit, and because there are no unnatural and abnormal conditions to inspire in us any suspicion regarding that experience. The validity of the past experience being previously ascertained, we do not feel any necessity to prove it once again with every subsequent experience of fruit so that the present experience cannot be supposed to refer back to all similar experiences of the past in the form of an infinite regress.¹ The consciousness of fruit however in dream is not a fact of the normal and healthy mind; and with such consciousness there goes a feeling of doubt and suspicion as to the reality of the fruit. The dreamer asks within himself: 'Is the thing, I now find, really real?' In such cases, the validity of our knowledge

¹ फलज्ञानमभासदशापन्नतया तज्जातीयत्वेन लिङ्गेनावधारिताव्यभिचारमेव। एवं तत्पूर्वं तत्पूर्वतरं तत्पूर्वतमिति। न च संप्रतिपन्नस्य फलज्ञानस्य प्रामाण्यावधारणापेक्षानीमेव पूर्वस्य फलज्ञानस्य तज्जातीयत्वेन प्रामाण्यावधारणे सख्यनवस्तेति वाच्यम्। पूर्वतरसाधर्म्येण पूर्वस्य पूर्वमेवावधृतप्रमाचलात्। Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā on Nyāya-sūtra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

of fruit should be put to the test of 'successful action' or conative satisfaction.¹ Applying this test we find that the dreamer's consciousness of fruit is not valid, since the craving for that fruit and the striving for its attainment recur even in the state of dream, not to speak of what happens when the dreamer is roused from sleep and the whole fabric of dreaming fancy vanishes away. Hence the validity of our knowledge of fruit is known from its being a fact of the normal healthy mind and from its concordance with the established order of our past experience.²

Let us now try to determine more precisely the logical character of the argument employed by the Naiyāikas to establish the validity of *pramāna*. According to them, as we have already seen, a *pramāna* is known to be valid when by virtue of its correspondence to the object, it leads to successful reaction or conative satisfaction.³ The validity of a *pramāna* is thus to be *inferred* from its capacity for producing fruitful actions.⁴ A *pramāna* or source of knowledge as such is not self-proved, nor can we say that validity is so inherent in all cognitions as to make itself evident and thereby leave no doubt as to their claims to validity. This is the principle of self-evidence with regard to *pramāna* (स्वतः-प्रामाण्यम्). But this principle cannot be said to have universal application to all cases and instances of *pramāna*. It is not infrequently seen that doubt arises as to the truth of many cognitions which, on closer view, are subsequently found to be valid (प्रामाण्यसंशयः). Hence the validity of *pramāna* is not to be regarded as self-proved but is to be established on some

¹ एतेषु च मध्ये यत्फलज्ञानं स्वप्नादुपभोगतुल्यतया शक्तित्व्यभिचारं तदनभ्यासदशापन्नमतः प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यं तत्र प्रामाण्यावधारणाय निवेशनीयमित्यर्थः । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² अस्मादभ्यासदशापन्नत्वं प्रामाण्याविनाभूतलिङ्गोपलब्धतया तज्जातीयत्वं पुनः स्वस्यावस्थस्य फलज्ञानत्वमेव । Udayanāchārya, Tātparyaparisuddhi.

³ प्रमाणतोऽर्थप्रतिपत्तौ प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यादयं प्रमाणम् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya.

⁴ प्रामाण्यं हि समर्थप्रवृत्तिजनकत्वादनुमेयम् । Udayanāchārya, Tātparyaparisuddhi.

other valid ground and known from some valid source (परतः प्रामाण्यम्).¹ This source in the Naiyāikas' account of pramāna is of the nature of an inference of a formal-material character. It is first stated as a general or formal principle of truth that what is valid produces successful action. This general principle is also shown to be materially true by reference to certain positive instances in which a valid cognition leads to successful reaction, as well as certain negative instances in which absence of validity means an absence of fruitful action.² Next by the application of this

¹ Broadly speaking four different views have been held by different schools of Indian philosophy with regard to the nature of our knowledge of validity and invalidity in the sphere of knowledge. Pārthasārathi Misra in his Shūstra-Dipikā quotes the following to show what these different views are and by whom they were advocated: “प्रमाणात्माप्रमाणात् स्वरतः साक्षाः समाश्रिताः । नैयायिकास्तै परतः सीगताश्रयं स्वरतः ॥ प्रथमं परतः प्राहुः प्रामाण्यं वेदवादिनः । प्रमाणात् स्वरतः प्राहु परतश्चाप्रमाणात्ताम् ॥”

This shows that, according to the Sāṅkhya-philosophers, both the validity and invalidity of our ideas and cognitions are self-evident and therefore perceived by us immediately without the help of any reasoning or inference. The Naiyāikas maintain just the opposite view that neither validity nor invalidity is self-evident but that both must be proved by some other valid reason than the ideas or cognitions in question. According to the Buddhists, invalidity is self-evident in all knowledge and all objects, while validity, if it exists anywhere, must be ascertained by the help of independent reasoning. The Vedāntist view is opposed to the Buddhistic in that validity, according to it, is self-evident while invalidity is to be known by means of reasoning, based on separate and independent grounds. But, I shall show later on, the Naiyāikas do not accept the principle of non-self-evidence (परतः प्रामाण्यम्) to the total exclusion of the other, namely, self-evidence. Though they agree generally in holding that all knowledge may be proved by independent grounds, still some of them, such as Vācaspati, Udayana and others, concede that the validity of some sources of knowledge, such as inference, self-consciousness, comparison, etc., is self-evident and so known by us directly and immediately.

² यथा प्रमाणाभास इति व्यतिरेकी हेतुः अन्यव्यतिरेकी वा । अनुमानस्य स्वरतः प्रमाणात्तत्त्वान्वयस्यापि संभवात् । Vācaspati, Tātparyatikā.

principle it is proved that *pramāna* is valid and has a true correspondence with its object because it leads to successful activity on the part of the knowing subject. Syllogistically put the inference stands thus :

Whatever leads to successful activity is valid, as in a flawless inference but not in doubt, error, etc.

Pramāna leads to successful activity.

Therefore *pramāna* is valid.

In this reference, it will be seen, the ground of conclusion or the middle term (हेतुः) is successful activity or conative satisfaction (प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यम्). The ground or the middle term is universally connected with the major term (साध्यः), namely, validity as is found in both the positive and negative instances (उदाहरणम्) cited in support of it. It is also found in connection with the minor term (पक्षः) namely *pramāna* and thereby establishes a connection between the minor and the major terms namely *pramāna* and validity.¹ The ground of conclusion is thus valid and perfect since it is the mark or sign which, by its agreement with or difference from certain recognised examples, establishes what sources of knowledge are valid and what are not so.²

§ 4. *The Factors of Knowledge.*

Now we proceed to consider the Nyāya account of the implications of *pramāna* and the essential factors involved in knowledge. By *pramāna* we are to understand the means or the source of valid cognition of objects.³ Hence in connection with *pramāna* there must be certain objects, a true and cognitive knowledge of those objects and an intelligent subject

¹ व्याप्तिपक्षधर्मताशालि हि लिङ्गं गमकसम्बन्धपगतसमुमानप्राप्ताख्यवादिभिः । Mādhava-Āchārya, *Sarva-darsana-Samgraha*, chapter on the Chārvāka System.

² उदाहरणसाधर्म्यात् साध्यसाधः हेतुः । तथा वैधर्म्यात् । Nyāya-sutras 34 and 35 An. 1, Ad. 1.

³ प्रमाणं हि प्रमाकारणम् । Udayana, *Parisuddhi*.

who has that knowledge.¹ Thus the very meaning of the word 'pramāna' implies three other factors or conditions in order to a complete conception of itself.

In the first place, it implies that there must be a subject or cogniser in which the cognition centres and of which it is the attribute. In every cognition there must be an intelligent agent or *pramātā* which is the substantive ground of the cognition and is the source of the conative processes that follow on it.² The *pramātā* or the subject exists in and for itself and is, in this sense, independent. This independence of the *pramātā* is known from the facts that it enjoys the fruits of all actions, that it is the centre or the substratum of all forms of activity, and that it directs the course of other things without being itself determined in its course by them.³

Secondly *pramāna* implies some object or *prameya*, which may be either existent or non-existent, to which the process of cognition refers or to which it is directed.⁴ The existent as well as the non-existent may be the object of apprehension by means of *pramāna*, but the apprehension takes different forms in the two cases. In the case of existent objects our cognitions are positive and do not depend on any other objects than their own, while the cognition of non-existent

¹ स (प्रमाता) येनार्थं रमिष्यति तत् प्रमाणम् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya.

Cf. मितिः सम्यक्परिच्छिन्नसत्त्वता च प्रमादता । तद्योगव्यवच्छेदः प्रमाणं गौतमे मते । Udayana, Kusumāñjali, Stavaka 4, Sloka 5.

साधनाग्रथाव्यतिरिक्तत्वे सति प्रमात्यात् प्रमाणम् । Mūdhava-Āchārya, Sarva-darsana-samgraha, chapter on the Akshapāda System.

² तत्र यत्वेसाजिज्ञासाप्रयुक्तस्य प्रवृत्तिः स प्रमाता । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya.

Cf. प्रमाण्यः प्रमातेति...रुमवाधिकारणं प्रमाता भवतीत्यर्थः । Bhāsarvajna, Nyāya-sāra.

³ प्रमाता स्वतन्त्रः किं पुनः स्वातन्त्र्यं कारकफलोपभोक्तृत्वं...तत्समाधो वा...क्रियायाः पुरुष आश्रयो भवति । तत्रयोक्तृत्वमितराप्रयोज्यता वा । यद्वा परिदृष्टः सन्त्यागि कारकवृत्ताणि प्रवृत्ते तेषु न प्रयुज्यते । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

⁴ योऽर्थः प्रतीयते तत् प्रमेयम् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya.

Cf. प्रमाविषयः प्रमेयमिति । प्रमाया योऽर्थः प्रतिभाति स प्रमेयं विषयोऽर्थ इति यावत् । एतेन सद्रूपमसद्रूपं वा न किञ्चिद्वानुद्दिष्टं प्रमाविषयत्वेन सर्वस्य प्रमेयत्वादिति । Jayasinha on Bhāsarvajna's Nyāya-sāra.

objects is negative and conditional on the apprehension of similar existent objects. Thus the light of the same lamp which reveals the existence of certain perceived objects in a dark room, also establishes the non-existence of those that are not perceived, for if the latter were existent they would have been perceived, together with the similar and the perceived objects.¹ Hence just as there can be no cognition without a conscious subject that has or owns the cognition, so there can be nothing worthy of the name of cognition unless there be an object—a thing or an attribute, a state or a process, a fact or a thought, which is to be cognised. Thus subject and object are strictly correlative factors involved in every process of cognition. They are distinguishable no doubt as the knower and the known but are separable in no act of cognition.

Lastly *pramāna* implies the state of valid cognition (प्रमा, प्रमितिः), that is, the mental state in which the object is cognised and to which the *pramāna* leads as its result or product.² Thus we see that the very notion of *pramāna* involves the *pramātā* or the subject who knows, the *prameya* or the object which is known and the *pramiti* or the state of valid cognition which is the psychic product of *pramāna* and in which there is a right cognition of the object.³

We have then four factors or conditions in all acts of human knowledge, namely, a subject or *pramātā*, an object

¹ प्रमाणेन सदसतो गम्यते...सतत्त्वपरतन्त्रोपलब्धानुपलब्धिकारणभावाच्च विशेषः सखलु प्रमाणस्थालत्वं सतत्त्वं भवति असत्तु परतत्त्वं प्रतिषेधसुखेन प्रतिपद्यते प्रदोषवदिति । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

सतः प्रकाशकं प्रमाणमसदपि प्रकाशयतीति । सत्युपलब्धमाने तदनुपलब्धेः प्रदोषवत् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya.

² यदर्थं विज्ञानं सा प्रमितिः । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya.

Cf. also :

सम्बन्धगुणवः प्रमेति । प्रमितिः प्रमाणफलमिति यावत् । Bhāsarvajna, Nyāya-sāra.

³ Cf. ननु कथं प्रमादादीनां प्रामाण्यप्रसक्तिः... । व्युत्पत्तिबलादित्याचक्षते । अनुभवतौति कर्तव्युपपत्त्या प्रमानुरनुभूयत इति कर्मव्युत्पत्त्या प्रमेयस्यानुभूतिरिति भावव्युत्पत्त्या प्रमायाश्च... । Jayasinha on Bhāsarvajna's Nyāya-sāra.

or *prameya*, the state of valid cognition or *pramiti*, and lastly the means of knowledge or *pramāna*, which is instrumental towards the production of right knowledge. Each of these is as essential to the concept of knowledge as the rest and each of them forms a necessary prerequisite, an essential condition of knowledge. In these four factors, when taken together in one whole, but never as disjoined, the circuit of knowledge and reality completes itself.¹ That is, the subject having known the real by means of *pramāna*, either as desirable or as undesirable or as neither, proceeds to obtain it or avoid it or remains indifferent to it, as the case may be, and so ends in actual attainment or avoidance or neglect of the objects known.²

The real has thus a value for the knowing subject, so that our account of reality as absolutely foreign to our subjective purposes and personal values would be a fundamental misconception of it. Nor again is knowledge a passive and lifeless reflection of reality. On the other hand, it is that philosophic view of the real which has its basis in the vital needs of our spiritual nature and is essentially conducive to the attainment of our supreme life-purpose, namely, the summum bonum.³ Herein, I think, lies one of the striking points of contrast between eastern and western philosophy. In the west, philosophy is only a matter of intellectual understanding. It is a reflective knowledge of the nature and relations of things and beings, and bears on life in the same general way in which our intellect influences our will,

¹ चतसृषु चैवं विधासु तत्त्वं परिसमाप्यते । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya.

² तत्त्वपरिसमाप्तिर्विनियोगयोग्यता उपेक्षता वा, या, सावविशंवादिता सावधारितस्यार्थस्य विनियोग-योग्यता, सुखसाधनं वा दुःखसाधनं वाऽयमर्थ इति ज्ञात्वा विनियोगः समाप्तिकामाप्तिकामतिषेधश्च । यथा न सुख-साधनं न दुःखसाधनमित्युपेक्षेति । Udyotakara, Nyāya-vārttika.

³ प्रमाण-प्रमेय...नियहृत्स्थानानां तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगमः । Nyāya-sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

तत्त्वज्ञानाद्दुःखात्यन्तोच्छेदलक्षणं निःश्रेयसं भवतीति समानतन्त्रेऽपि प्रतिपादितं तदाह सूत्रकारः प्रमाण-प्रमेयेत्यादि-तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगम इति । Mādhava-Āchārya, Sarvadarsana-Sangraha, chapter on the Akshapāda System.

but is never carried on with the express intention and determined will to solve the problems and work out the final good of life. To the Indian philosophers, however, philosophy was not a mere rational knowledge of things and theories, but a direct means to the realisation of our life-end and the path to the final goal of life.

From the above analysis of knowledge it is clear that the subject or *pramātā*, the object or *prameya*, the resulting state of cognition or *pramiti* and the means of knowledge or *pramāna* are all necessary conditions of knowledge. Hence the question naturally arises: How are we to distinguish the *pramāna* from the other factors of knowledge? Wherein *pramāna* lies the ground or reason for its claim to the title of 'the source or the means of knowledge?'¹ The answer to this question is to be found in two very important considerations. The *pramāna* is rightly called 'the source of knowledge' because it is the supreme condition, the most efficient cause of knowledge, it is the ground *par excellence*.² Whereas the other factors are indeed logically implied in all knowledge, it is the only condition that is the operative ground (साधनम्), the instrumental means (करणम्) on which, under normal circumstances, knowledge invariably and unconditionally follows. It is the immediate *ratio cognoscendi* in knowledge, the instrumental cause of it, while the other factors are the common grounds, indirect causes and the logical implications (व्युत्पत्तिवलायातम्) involved in all knowledge. That *pramāna* is the supreme condition and the most important ground of knowledge will appear from the following facts

¹ व्युत्पत्तिवलायातुः प्रमाणं ननु प्रमादप्रमेययोरपि उपलब्धिहेतुत्वात् प्रमाणत्वं प्रसज्येत विशेधो वा नक्तव्य इति Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

साधकतमलाहा न प्रसङ्गः। Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

Cf. "साधकतमं करणम्" Pāṇini; "करणं साधकतमम्।" Amara-kosa.

Cf. also: प्रमादप्रमेयव्यवच्छेदार्थं फलाहे दशापनार्थं च साधनग्रहणम्। Bhāsarvajña, Nyāya-sūtra,

In the first place, we find that between *pramāna* and valid knowledge there is agreement in presence as well as in absence. A *pramāna* is always accompanied by valid knowledge which, in its turn, can never arise without the former. Of course there can be no valid knowledge without a subject or *pramātā* and an object or *prameya*. But every case of the presence of *pramātā* and a *prameya* is not necessarily a case of the presence of valid knowledge while, contrariwise, every case of the presence of *pramāna* is perforce a case of the presence of valid knowledge.¹ Thus a man has no cognition of object to which he does not attend although he, as subject, and those objects exist side by side. If however, the objects produce their impressions on his senses and his mind reacts on those impressions, he cannot but have a cognition of those objects.

Secondly, we observe that a subject or *pramātā* arrives at a true knowledge of objects only when it has the appropriate *pramāna* or means of knowledge at its disposal. Contrariwise we find that the *pramātā* and the *prameya* cannot produce any right cognition in the absence of the *pramāna* or the means of knowledge.²

Thirdly, we see that *pramāna* is the last link in the chain of conditions that leads to valid cognition. It is the immediate antecedent to the production of knowledge inasmuch as the aggregate of causal conditions on which knowledge depends is completed by *pramāna* and the effect, *viz.* knowledge, follows immediately on it. That is, *pramāna* s

¹ भावाभावयोस्तद्वत्ता, न प्रमातरि प्रमेये वाऽसति प्रमा भवति सति तु भवति न पुनः सति भवत्येव प्रमाणि तु सति भवति भवत्येव सोऽयमतिशयः साधकतमत्वमुच्यते। Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

प्रमातृप्रमेयाभ्यां सङ्ग प्रमोत्पादस्यायोग्यवच्छेदेन सम्बन्धः प्रमाणेन सङ्ग प्रमोत्पादस्यायोग्ययोग्यवच्छेदाभावात्त्विति शयः। Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² यद्वात्मा प्रमिसीते सोऽतिशयः किंवा प्रमिसीते प्रमाणावान् प्रमिसीते प्रमाणे सति प्रमिसीते नासतीति। सतीर्वाःकर्तृत्वं यदभावात् यस्य चाभावात् प्रमातृप्रमेये न प्रमां कुरुतः सोऽतिशयः। Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

the last antecedent condition on which knowledge follows first and immediate.¹

Next we observe that *pramāna* is the special ground that accounts for the special forms of knowledge, while the other factors as common and general conditions, cannot explain the specific forms of it. Thus the *pramātā* and the *prameya* may be the same in different forms of cognitive knowledge, such as perception, inference, etc., so that they cannot explain why one form of knowledge is called perception, another form called inference and so forth. This can be explained by *pramāna* which takes different forms in different instances of knowledge and thereby explains the special forms of it. Thus one form of knowledge is called perception and another form is called inference because they are due to different *pramānas* or arise from different sources of knowledge.² Similarly we find that the mind's contact with the soul is the common mediate cause of all forms of knowledge, since there can be no knowledge of objects unless the soul is attentive, i.e., turns the mind to and fixes attention on those objects. Now the mind's contact with the soul takes different definite forms in the different kinds of knowledge. But this cannot be explained by the *pramātā* nor the *prameya*, for they may be the same in different forms of knowledge. It is the *pramāna* that gives different definite forms to the mind's contact with the soul in different kinds of knowledge.³ From all this we conclude that *pramāna* is the supreme condition of knowledge, the most efficient cause of it.

¹ संयोगवच्चरमभाविता वा...तथा प्रमाणं चरमभावि प्रमादप्रमेययोः प्रमाशक्तिर्भवति पञ्चाह्वाऽतिशयः । प्रतिपत्तेरानन्तर्यं वा । यथा प्रमाणागन्तरं प्रतिपत्तेर्जन्म स चायमतिशय इति ।

² असाधारणकारणता वा प्रमाता तावत् साधारणं कारणं सर्वप्रतिपत्तीनां प्रमेयमध्यक्षेषु रूप-साधारणत्वात्तथाभूतं प्रमाणं त्वसाधारणकारणत्वात् प्रधानम् ।

³ प्रमाकारणसंयोगविशेषकत्वं वा यो वा प्रमाकारणं संयोगस्तस्य प्रमाणमनुगृहे वर्तमानमतिशय-शब्दवाच्यम् । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

प्रमाया असमवायिकारणं खलात्मनः संयोगः स च सर्व्वप्रमासाधारणी नास्ती प्रमाया प्रमेयेषु वा श्रक्तो विशिष्टम् । तथौरपि तद्वदेव साधारण्यात् । असाधारणं तु प्रमाणं यथायथमात्मनः संयोगमवच्छिनत्ति । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

The second consideration, on which the superiority of *pramāna* to the other factors is based, is this. The primary function of knowledge lies in its correspondence to the nature and attributes of its object (अर्थवत्त्वम्), although this correspondence is to be known from the fact that the knowledge prompts an activity ending in fruition (प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यम्). Now for the fulfilment of this function knowledge is directly dependent on *pramāna*, and the other factors of knowledge have this mark of correspondence to objective reality only as they derive it from *pramāna* itself.¹ *Pramāna* is directly instrumental to the production of valid cognition of object, so that without it there can be no true cognition even if there be a subject to cognise and an object to be cognised. The subject cannot directly produce the state of valid cognition, for as an agent it requires means to bring about a result and cannot itself directly produce the result. Nor can the object be said to produce the state of valid cognition, for in inference the object is absent and cannot therefore be operative in producing a knowledge of itself in the knowing subject.² It is indeed true that in every act of true knowledge, the subject, the object and the state of knowledge are all accompanied by valid cognition. But the subject or the *pramātā*, the object or the *prameya* and the process of knowledge do not originate the state of valid cognition but owe that state to the influence of *pramāna* which must therefore be said to be the supreme condition of knowledge. Hence *pramāna* is called 'the source of knowledge, as distinguished from the *pramātā* and the *prameya* which are

¹ अर्थवति च प्रमाणे प्रमाता प्रमेयं प्रमितिरित्यर्थवन्ति भवन्ति ।... अन्यतमापायेऽर्थस्यानुपपत्तेः ।
Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya.

अन्यतमार्थः साधकतमार्थो द्रष्टव्यः प्रकरणात् प्रकरणं हि चतुर्वर्गे प्रमाणं प्रधानमिति वक्ष्यते ।
Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

² सर्वैः कर्ता करणगीचरव्यापारी न साक्षात्फलं व्याप्तिरिति । तस्मिन्नेतन्न प्रमाता साक्षात्प्रमाहेतुः कर्तृत्वात् । तथा प्रत्यक्षे प्रमेयं न साक्षात्प्रमाहेतुः प्रमेयत्वात् । यद्यत्प्रमेयं तत्तत्त्वं न साक्षात्प्रमाहेतुः अनुमेयादिवत् तथा चैतत्तथा । Vāchaspati, Tūtparyatikā.

indeed logically implied in all knowledge but do not originate and directly produce the state of valid knowledge.¹

§ 5. *Objections considered.*

Several objections may be raised against the Nyāya account of *pramāna*. The first of these arises from the question as to the relation between *pramāna* and 'fruitful action' (*प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यम्*). The validity of a *pramāna*, we have seen, is to be known from the fact that it leads to successful action through a right cognition of objects. Hence it appears that prior to the fruition of our activities, a *pramāna* cannot be ascertained to be valid, so that the validity of the *pramāna* is open to doubt at this stage. The *pramāna* being thus an instrument of doubtful efficacy we cannot use it for the acquisition of certain knowledge of objects. But, on the other hand, in the absence of a true knowledge of object we cannot successfully act in relation to them, *i.e.*, there can be no successful activity directed towards those objects.² An action, in order to be successful, supposes a true knowledge of its object as something which is the means to some good end. But in order to know that the object is a means to some good end we must have recourse to a valid inference in which we argue from the similarity of the object to other things previously known to be the means to good ends, that the object in question is such a means to some good end. Hence a true knowledge of objects as the sure means to

¹ अयं विशेषः प्रमाणे प्रमादप्रमेययोश्चरितार्थत्वात् प्रमाणे प्रमाता प्रमेयं च चरितार्थम् । अचरितार्थं च प्रमाणं अतस्तद्वैधोपलब्धिसाधनमिति । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

तदिदं प्रमादप्रमेययोः प्रमाणे चरितार्थत्वमचरितार्थत्वं प्रमाणस्य तस्मात्तद्वैधोपलब्धौ फलहेतुः । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² यदि तावत् प्रमाणात् पूर्वैकमर्थप्रतिपत्तिः प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यमन्तरिणं किमिति प्रतिपद्यते । अथ पूर्वं प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यमनवधारणार्थं किमिति प्रवर्तते... । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika on Sūtra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

some good end, is the precondition of our successful activity in relation to them.¹

Thus the Naiyāikas seem to be placed on the horns of a dilemma. A true knowledge of objects, as the sure means to some good end, is the essential prerequisite to our successful activity in relation to those objects. That is, before we can efficaciously act in relation to an object we must know, through a valid inference, that the object in question is the unfailing means to our desired end. But in order to know that our knowledge of the object is true and valid we require to know the ground of truth and validity in general, *i.e.*, we are to ascertain *pramāna* or the source of true knowledge. Hence it is established that successful activity (समर्थप्रवृत्ति) must be preceded by a true knowledge of the object of that activity as well as by an understanding of the ground of true knowledge or *pramāna*.²

But on the other hand, the true knowledge of the object and *pramāna* is to be ascertained by means of successful activity. The validity of knowledge and *pramāna* is to be known from the fact that they lead to fruitful action through a right cognition of object. Hence the difficulty is that prior to the ascertainment of *pramāna* there can be no fruitful action, while, on the other hand, prior to fruitful action there can be no ascertainment of *pramāna*. Thus the ascertainment of *pramāna* (प्रमाणतत्त्वविनिश्चयः) presupposes 'fruitful action' (प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यम्) while 'fruitful action' presupposes an ascertainment of *pramāna*.³ Hence it follows

¹ न तावदर्थप्रतिपत्तिः प्रवृत्तिहेतुरपि तु तद्विनिश्चयः । न च तन्मात्रम् अपि तु तदर्थज्ञातीयम् श्रेयो-हेतुतादृशसकृदुपलब्धमानस्यार्थस्य तज्ज्ञातीयतया श्रेयोहेतुभावात्तुमानसङ्घिता विनिश्चितिः प्रवृत्तिहेतुः । Vāchaspati Misra, Tātparyatikā.

² से. श्रेयःसाधनतातुमानसङ्घिता प्रमाणतोऽर्थप्रतिपत्तिः विनिश्चितिः समर्थप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तमुक्ता । न चार्थविनिश्चयः प्रामाण्यावधारणमन्तरेण । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

³ प्रामाण्यावधारणं च श्रेयोहेतुतातुमाननिमित्तव्याप्तिवृत्त्यर्थं च न समर्थप्रवृत्तिं विना । न च समर्थप्रवृत्तिस्वाभ्यां विनैति परस्परान्तरता । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

ननु प्रवृत्तिप्रामाण्यनिश्चययोरेव परस्पराक्षेपतया परस्पराशयत्वं... । Vardhamānopādhyāya, Nyāya-nibandhaprakāśa.

that, as 'fruitful action' and the ascertainment of *pramāna* reciprocally presuppose each other, neither of them can be established as prior or posterior to the other, so that there cannot be ascertainment of the validity of *pramāna* at all.'

The Naiyāikas proceed to meet the above objection with a just recognition of the difficulties raised in it. According to them, the validity of *pramāna* is not self-evident and self-proved, but is to be established by means of other valid grounds and reasons. In the case of new objects of experience, such other valid grounds and reasons for establishing the validity of *pramāna*, lie in the success of practical activity.¹ That is, the validity of *pramāna* is to be known from its capacity to produce fruitful action, in so far as it bears on such objects of experience as are new and unfamiliar to us. Hence the validity of our knowledge of such objects is to be inferred from the success of the action inspired by it, so that prior to the fruition of our activities its validity remains open to doubt.

So far the objection is valid and the Naiyāikas have nothing to say against this part of it. But the other part of the objection is not quite sound and the Naiyāikas' attacks are directed just to this side of it. Here it is contended that since an action, to be fruitful, presupposes a true knowledge of objects as well as of *pramāna*, it cannot be ground of proving the validity of its presupposition. It is here that the Naiyāikas point out that a true and certain knowledge of objects is by no means the invariable condition of our action in relation to them. An apprehension of objects, whether right or wrong, is the sufficient ground for producing certain modes of action on the part of the apprehending subject.² For action as such we do not require a

¹ तत्र घुमः सत्यं न स्वतः प्रामाण्यं शक्यविधारणं परतत्त्वं दृष्टार्थस्वतन्त्रासदशापेक्षु प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यादेव तद्व्यतिरेकः। Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikū.

² अर्थप्रतीत्यधीना तु प्रवृत्तिनिर्वाहविधारणाधीना। Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikū.

true and certain knowledge of objects, nor any knowledge of the nature of *pramāna*, far less an ascertainment of *pramāna*.¹ It may be true that right and efficacious voluntary action supposes a right knowledge of the things with which we have to deal in the course of our action. But it is equally true that there may be and actually is action as such, even when there is no sure knowledge of objects, that we act even in the midst of uncertainty, that while acting we may have grave doubts as to the attainment of the fruit of our action.²

Hence there is no gainsaying the fact that an action is quite possible on the ground of simple apprehension of objects and in the absence of a certain knowledge of them. If this be so, then another consequence follows which is calculated to clear up the whole situation and to offer an adequate solution of the difficulty raised in the above objection. It is a matter of common observation that an experient subject may have a right cognition of objects through a certain *pramāna*, say perception or inference, even though he lacks a previous critical appreciation of the validity of that source.³ This being so, the subject will, subsequently to his cognition of objects, act in certain ways in relation to them. Now the success of these actions, their producing the desired result, will convince the subject of the validity of that particular source of knowledge. If however his actions, as inspired by some other knowledge, become unsuccessful, then, in the absence of any other reasons for such failure, the subject will become convinced of the invalidity of that knowledge as well as of its source.

¹ इह च द्विविधा प्रवृत्तिः... । ऐहिकफलान्वेषितलोपायता ज्ञानमात्राधीना अर्थनिश्चयमपि नापेक्षते, प्रागेव प्रामाण्यस्वरूपज्ञानं, कुतस्कारं तद्विनिश्चयम् । Udayanācārya, Tātparyā-parisuddhi.

² अर्थसंदेहादपि प्रवृत्तिर्ना प्रवृत्तेः । नो खलु पाथता विनिश्चयेनापि प्रवर्तमाना अनागतफलं न संदिहते । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

संदेहाप्रियथादृष्टहीनप्रामाण्यात् प्रवृत्तिदृशनादित्यर्थः । Vardhamānupādhyāya, Nyāya-nibandha-prakūsa.

³ ननु प्रामाण्यवधारणं विनाऽपि चक्षुरादिनाऽर्थनिश्चयो भवत्येव । Ibid.

The validity of a *pramāna* in relation to new objects of experience, is thus known from the success of the action that is inspired by it but is not accompanied by any certain knowledge of it or of its objects. Here then the ascertainment of the validity of *pramāna* is posterior to the fruition of practical activity. When however we have once ascertained the validity of a particular *pramāna* in this way, we may well understand the validity of other analogous sources of knowledge, in relation to familiar objects of experience, even before the fruition of our actions, arising out of them. Here the validity of the other sources of knowledge is ascertained by means of their essential resemblance to the accredited *pramāna* as also their objects are definitely recognised to be familiar instances of objects previously known.¹ With the previous knowledge of the validity of *pramāna* we may then proceed to act successfully, so that in the case of the familiar objects of experience the ascertainment of *pramāna* is prior to 'fruitful action.' But even where the ascertainment of *pramāna* is due to its own independent ground, it is not expressly meant for our practical activity nor is it the incitant to such action.² In any case we see that the ascertainment of *pramāna* is in no way precluded by its relation to 'fruitful action' or conative satisfaction (प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यम्).

It may indeed be urged here that though fruitful action does not presuppose a reflective knowledge of the true nature of objects and of *pramāna*, yet it supposes an inferential knowledge of the objects of our activity as the means to our desired end. Hence the consciousness of means and the fruition of practical action presuppose each other, for how

¹ तदानीं भेदिज्ञाना अपि प्रवर्त्तमानाः प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यात्प्रमाणस्य तत्त्वं विनिश्चित्य तज्ज्ञातीयस्यान्वयाध्यासद्वयापन्नस्य प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यात्प्रागिव तज्ज्ञातीयत्वेन लिङ्गेन प्रमाण्यावधारणादर्थविनिश्चयेन प्रवर्त्तन्ते ।
Vāchaspati, Tātparyatika.

² यद्यपि प्रवृत्तेः प्रागिव प्रमाणतत्त्वविनिश्चयः तदाप्यसौ स्वहेतुबलादायातो न प्रवृत्तिं प्रति प्रयोजकः ।
Udayanāchārya, Tātparya-parisuddhi.

can there be any consciousness of certain objects as means unless we find that the use of such means makes our action fruitful. This however, the Naiyāika points out, is no real difficulty. If the objects that we are now to use as means, were previously experienced by us as such, then their presentation at the present moment would excite the latent mental impressions left by them and lead to a recollection of them as means and then to consciousness of the present objects as means by virtue of their similarity of the objects of past experience. With this knowledge of the objects as means we may proceed to act and finally come to an ascertainment of the validity of our knowledge on the ground of the success of such actions.¹ If, on the other hand, the objects are entirely new, we are in doubt about their efficacy as means. Nevertheless, considering their relations to known objects we may act on the hypothesis that these objects may serve as means, and then find out the validity of our hypothetical knowledge in the light of the successfulness of the actions, based on it.

If in the face of these considerations any one contends that the way to the ascertainment of pramāna is hopelessly barred, since it depends on the fruition of practical activity which, in its turn, depends on previous certain knowledge of pramāna, we reply that the contention itself stands self-condemned. Prior to the success of his activity, necessary for carrying on the process of contention, the contender is not himself absolutely sure of the validity of his contention. But in the absence of such sure knowledge he cannot, consistently with his own supposition, begin the process of contention at all.² Further one who denies the possibility

¹ अर्थस्यापेक्षितोपायतानुमानप्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्ययोः परस्परपेक्षितमवशिष्यते । तदाप्यनादितापरिहारः । उत्पन्नमात्रस्य हि बालकस्य स्नानं दृष्ट्वा प्राग्भवोद्यस्तज्जातीयपेक्षितानुभवजनितः स्कार आविरसि ततश्च स्कारणं ततोऽपेक्षितोपायतानुमानं ततः प्रवृत्तिसत्तः तस्याः सामर्थ्यम् । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² अन्यथैकान्तिकविजयानिश्चये प्रामाण्याच्चपक्व एव विजिगीषुः कथायां न प्रवर्तते । Udayanāchārya, Tātparyā-parisuddhi.

of ascertaining *pramāna*, must do so on the ground either of some *pramāna* or of none. If it be on the basis of no *pramāna*, then his act of denial is a mere freak of the dogmatist and as such deserves no consideration. If, on the other hand, his act of denial be based on some valid *pramāna*, he cannot but admit the possibility of ascertaining it, for how can he deny the knowledge of *pramāna* unless he has already ascertained it to be of such a nature as to make it incomprehensible to our minds.¹ The conclusion from all this is that the validity of *pramāna* as well as the possibility of its ascertainment must be admitted by all.

Now to the second objection. This arises from the *Naiyāikas'* rigorism of proof and reasoning with regard to all objects of thought. They are, as is well known, generally in favour of adducing reasons and grounds for all the tenets and doctrines of philosophy. According to them, even the validity of a *pramāna* is not self-evident and self-proved, but must be deduced from other valid sources. But this gives rise to the following difficulties.

If the validity of a *pramāna* is to be established by means of some other *pramāna*, then the second *pramāna* must require a third to prove its validity and so on *ad infinitum*.² On this hypothesis, therefore, the process of adducing proofs and deducing conclusions will go on as an infinite chain of arguments, in which every link will hang on the next but the last is never to be found nor even thought of. But this means that we can have no final rest in the matter of proving an object nor answer any question finally and to our complete satisfaction.³

¹ तथा हि प्रमाणप्रवृत्त्युपायं प्रत्याचक्षाण एव प्रष्टव्यो जायते किं भवात्प्रमाणेन प्रमाणज्ञानोपायं प्रत्याचष्टे अप्रमाणेन वा । यदि ब्रूयात्प्रमाणेनेति स प्रतिवक्तव्यः प्रमाणज्ञानोपायमविद्वान् कथं भवानिवमाहेति । अप्रमाणेनेति चेत् । अनुशयाः स्तितव्यम् । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

² प्रमाणतः सिद्धेः प्रमाणाणां प्रमाणान्तरसिद्धिप्रसङ्गः । Nyāya-sutra 17, An. 1, Ad. 2.

³ यदि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणेन उपलब्धन्ते, येन प्रमाणेनोपलब्धन्ते, तत्प्रमाणान्तरसङ्गावः प्रसज्यत इति । अनवस्थासाह । तस्याप्यन्यतरस्याप्यन्येनेति । न चानवस्था शक्याऽनुज्ञातुमनुपपत्तेरिति । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya on *supra*.

It means also that the Naiyāikas' enumeration of the sources of knowledge or pramānas as four is not correct, but that there must be many more than the four, recognised by them.¹

To avoid these difficulties it may be said that pramāna is established by itself and requires no other pramāna to prove its validity, so that there need not be any apprehension of an infinite chain of arguments yielding no final conclusion. But this supposition gives rise to other greater difficulties. If a pramāna be self-established, that is proved by itself, then the same thing may be said of the *prameya* or the objects of knowledge. Just as the pramānas or the means of knowledge are self-proved, so prameyas or the objects of knowledge are self-proved, and self-established, so that we require no pramāna at all for our knowledge of objects.² We have therefore nothing to do with the pramānas in the sphere of knowledge and as such the world will dissolve into a chaotic void.³ Moreover when we look into the matter more closely we find that it is not really possible for a pramāna to prove itself, for the same thing cannot certainly be both the ground of proof and the conclusion proved.⁴ It is therefore argued that the Naiyāikas cannot establish the validity of pramāna by any means.

¹ तत्र प्रमाणांतराभ्युपगमे विभागसूत्रव्याघातः अनवस्थापातश्च । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā on *supra*. The Sutra referred to here is this:

प्रत्यक्षानुमानोपमानशब्दाः प्रमाणाणि । Nyāya Sutra 3, An. 1, Ad. 1.

² तद्विनिवृत्तेर्वा प्रमाणांतरसिद्धिवत् प्रमेयसिद्धिः । Nyāya Sutra 18, An. 1, Ad. 2.

यदि प्रत्यक्षाद्युपलब्धौ प्रमाणांतरं निवर्तते, आत्मैर्युपलब्ध्वावपि प्रमाणांतरं निवर्त्येत्यविशेषात् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya on *supra*.

यथा प्रमाणाणि स्वोपलब्धौ निवर्तन्ते एवं प्रमेयसिद्धावपि । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

³ एवञ्च सर्वप्रमाणाविलोपः । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya.

एवं चेत् कृतं प्रमेयसाधनैः प्रमाणैः प्रमाणवदसाधनैवास्तु प्रमेयोपलब्धिरिति । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

तथा च अनवस्थितमेव जगत् स्यादिति गत्युपायं पर्यवसानमिति भावः । Visvanūtha, Nyāya-Sutra-Vṛitti on Sutra 18, An. 1, Ad. 2.

⁴ तथैव व्यक्ताय तु यद्धैव आत्मनि द्वित्वविरोधः । न हि तथैवासिधायाः सैवासिधारा द्वियते तस्मादसाधना प्रमाणीयत्वम् । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā.

To this objection, the Naiyāikas give but one reply which meets all the difficulties supposed to be involved in the Nyāya account of *pramāna*. According to them, a *pramāna* is not without its own ground and reason, nor is it self-established in the sense that the same individual *pramāna* serves as both the ground and the conclusion of proof, so that there is a contrariety of functions in the same thing.¹ A *pramāna* does indeed require a proof of its validity, but the required proof is to be found neither in the same individual *pramāna* nor in any thing other than the different individual *pramānas* coming under the four recognised classes, namely, perception, inference, comparison, and verbal testimony.² The validity of a particular *pramāna* is thus to be found in one other of the different specific forms of *pramāna*, included within the classes of perception, etc., so that the same thing is *pramāna* or the means of knowledge in relation to what it proves, and *prameya* or the object of knowledge in relation to that by which it is proved.

An illustration will make this clear. A *pramāna* is established in the same way in which the light of a lamp is established.³ Just as the light of a lamp which is *pramāna*, in relation to objects perceived by means of it, is itself established by another perception, through its contact with the eyes, so one act of perception, inference, etc., is established by another perception or inference or comparison or testimony, as the case may be, in each instance.⁴ Thus external perception is a *pramāna* in so far as it is the source of our

¹ नासाधनं प्रामाण्यसिद्धिः... । नापि तथैव व्यक्त्या तस्या एव ग्रहणमुपेयते येनात्मनि हतिविरोधो भवेत् । Vāchaspati, Tūtparyatikā on Sūtra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

² नापि प्रत्यक्षादित्यतिरिक्तप्रमाणाभ्युपगमो येन विभागसूत्रव्याघातः स्यात् । *Ibid.*

³ न प्रदीपप्रकाशवत् तद्विषये । Nyāya Sūtra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

⁴ यथा प्रदीपप्रकाशः प्रत्यक्षाज्ञत्वाद् ग्रहणं प्रमाणं, स च प्रत्यक्षान्तरिण, चक्षुषः सन्निकर्षेण गृह्यते ।... एवं प्रत्यक्षादीनां यथादर्शनं प्रत्यक्षादिभिरन्योपलब्धिः । प्रदीपप्रकाशो घटाद्युपलब्धिसाधनस्याज्ञत्वात् प्रमाणम्... नासाधनोपलब्धौ प्रत्यक्षादित्यतिरिक्तप्रमाणं प्रयोजयति तथा प्रमाणाद्यपि प्रत्यक्षादिभिरन्योपलब्धते । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika.

knowledge of external object. But this perception is itself to be established as valid by proving either through perception or inference, etc., the validity of all the factors involved in it. Here we have four factors, namely, sense-organs, objects, contact between the two, and the resulting act of cognition. Of these the first, namely, the sense-organ is established by means of *inference*, as the special recipient of one class of external stimuli. The objects are established by *sense-perception*. The third factor, namely, the contact between sense and object, is *inferred* from such obstructions as a wall or a screen which, when intervening between the sense-organs and the objects, hinders our perception of external objects. The resulting act of cognition is of course *perceived* by the self, through its special contact with the mind and its intimate relation with the cognition.¹

Again just as the light of the lamp is called prameya or the object of knowledge when it is seen by the eyes, and pramāna or the means of knowledge, when it shows external objects in darkness, so a particular pramāna is both the means and the object of knowledge in relation respectively to that which is cognised through it and that through which it is itself cognised.² Hence perception, inference, comparison and verbal testimony, as four different pramānas, are established by one or other of these four recognised sources of knowledge, as the case may be, with regard to any one of them. None of them requires any pramāna other than these four to establish its validity, nor is it established without the help of any pramāna at all.³

¹ इन्द्रियाणि तावत् स्वविषयग्रहणेनैवानुमीयन्ते । अर्थाः प्रत्यक्षतो गृह्यन्ते । इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षस्तु भावयोगेन लिङ्गेनानुमीयन्ते । इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षोऽप्यत्र 'ज्ञानमात्ममनसोः संयोगविशेषादात्मसमवायाच्च सुखादिवत् गृह्यन्ते । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya on Nyāya Sutra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

² यथा च दृश्यः सन् प्रदीपप्रकाशो दृश्यान्तराणां दर्शनहेतुरिति दृश्यदर्शनव्यवस्थां लभते । एवं प्रतीयं सत् किञ्चिदर्थजातमुपलब्धिहेतुत्वात् प्रमाणप्रतीयव्यवस्थां लभते ।

³ सेयं प्रत्यक्षादिभिरेव प्रत्यक्षादीनां यथादर्शनमुपलब्धिः, न प्रमाणांतरतः न च प्रमाणमन्तरेण निःसाधनेति । Vātsyāyanabhāṣhya on Sutra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

N. B.—It will not be out of place to note here that the sutra :
“न प्रदीपप्रकाशवत् तत्सिद्धेः” (Nyāya Sutra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2) has received

The validity of a *pramāna* is therefore established by another *pramāna*. Against this it cannot be urged that it is not possible for the same thing to be both the means and the object of knowledge. In establishing the validity of a *pramāna* it is not the same individual thing that is both the object and means of knowledge. What happens is that one particular *pramāna*, say one perception, is proved by another *pramāna*, which may be another perception, or inference, etc. These perceptions and inferences may be collectively called by the same name, perception or inference, but distributively they are so many distinct and individual acts of knowledge. Hence when one perception proves another it is not the same individual act of perception that is both the ground and

another interpretation which is quite different from what we have given above. Some writers, following the Vedāntists on this point, take the *sūtra* to mean that just as the light of a lamp is perceived without the help of any other light, so the *pramānas* are established without the help of any other *pramāna*, *i.e.*, they are self-established. Though this interpretation accords more with the Vedantist principle of self-evidence in *pramāna*, yet it does not appear to be the correct interpretation of the Naiyāyika view on this point. Vātsyāyana in his commentary on the Nyāya *sūtras* criticises this interpretation and rejects it because it cannot be supported by good reasons. In this Vātsyāyana was followed by the later commentators Udyotakara, Vāchaspati Misra, and others. According to them, if the example of the light of the lamp be taken to prove the self-evident character of *pramāna*, then it may be taken to prove that of the *prameya* as well. There is no reason why it should be applicable in the case of the *pramāna* and not in that of the *prameya*. But if it is applicable to the *prameya* or the objects of knowledge so as to prove their self-evident nature, then we have no need of *pramāna* at all. I am also of opinion that the *sūtra* cannot be taken to prove the self-evident character of *pramāna*, for, so taken, it will be no reply to the objection raised in the previous *sūtra*, as it is expressly meant to be. As that objection rests just on the supposition of the self-evident character of *pramāna*, the reply to it cannot reasonably be supposed to be the same as the objection itself. *Vide* Nyāya *Sūtras* 17, 18, 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

the object of proof, but one perception is the ground of proof while a different perception is the object proved.¹ Further in some cases at least we find that the same thing may be both the ground and the object of knowledge. In self-consciousness we find that the self is both the subject and the object of knowledge. So also in internal perception the mind is both the ground and the object of internal observation.²

It will be observed here that though the Naiyāikas admit that a pramāna must be established by other pramānas, yet these pramānas, according to them, are no other than the four recognised by them. Perception, inference, comparison and verbal testimony are the only four pramānas. We need not admit a fifth pramāna as distinct from and independent of these four. All objects, existent or non-existent, may be proved by these four; there is nothing which cannot be their object and for the knowledge of which we are to admit some other additional pramāna. If there were a class of things that could not be apprehended by these four pramānas, then we would have felt the necessity of seeking some other source of knowledge for them. But as there is no such class of objects, the admission of a fifth pramāna is unnecessary and unjustifiable.³

All this however does not obviate the difficulty of infinite regress, in which the attempt to prove the validity of pramāna is involved. If the validity of one perception or inference

¹ तेनैव तस्याग्रहणमिति चेत् न, अर्थभेदस्य लक्षणसामान्यात् प्रत्यक्षादीनाम् प्रत्यक्षादिभिरेव ग्रहणमित्युक्तम् ।... अर्थभेदस्य लक्षणसामान्यात् प्रत्यक्षलक्षणानेकोऽर्थः संगृहीतः । Vātsyāyana.

² ज्ञातमनसोऽयं दर्शनात्...तेनैव ज्ञाया तस्यैव ग्रहणं दृश्यते...तेनैव मनसा तस्मात्तुमानं दृश्यते । Vātsyāyana.

न तेनैव तस्य ग्रहणं भवतीति भवत्यपि कदाचित् यथात्मनि स एव ज्ञाता ज्ञेयो भवति यदात्मनः जानीत इति । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika on Sūtra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

³ प्रत्यक्षादिभिः प्रत्यक्षादीनां ग्रहणमित्युक्त्याद्यर्थभेदी न गृह्यत इति । प्रत्यक्षादीनाञ्चाविषयस्यानुपपत्तेः । प्रत्यक्षादीनां यथादर्शनमेवेदं सञ्ज्ञासर्वं सर्वे विषय इति । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya on Sūtra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

is to be established by another perception or inference, then the validity of the second perception, etc., must be proved by a third perception or inference, and that of the third by another still and so on *ad infinitum*. This process of proving one *pramāna* by another cannot stop at any stage, or, if it stops anywhere then the validity of that *pramāna* with which it stops is not proved and, as such, the *pramāna* is indistinguishable from a wrong source of knowledge.

This difficulty, the *Naiyāikas* tell us, is of no practical account. It does not really arise in the life of any man in the course of all possible practical activities. It is indeed undeniable that there are certain *pramānas* which require a knowledge of themselves in order to prove their objects and thereby lead to practical action. But it is equally true that there are certain other *pramānas* which prove their objects without any knowledge of themselves. Thus smoke must be perceived or known before it can lead to the knowledge of fire, but the sense-organs give us knowledge of objects even when they are not themselves perceived or known. Of course if we so desire we may know the sense-organs by other means, but that is only accidental and not always, nor absolutely, necessary for us. Hence in practical life we need not unceasingly go on proving one *pramāna* by another so that there is, on this account, no occasion for infinite regress in our life.¹ In fact, all of our practical activities are meant either for the attainment of prosperity, happiness, merit and salvation or for the avoidance of those things that hinder the realisation of these ends. All that such activity requires is a cognition of the means and objects of knowledge, but no infinite process of reasoning to prove the validity of the

¹ न चानवस्था अस्ति किंचित्प्रमाणं यत्स्वज्ञानेनाप्यधीहेतुः यथा धूमादि किंचित्पुनरज्ञातमेववृद्धि-
साधनं यथा चक्षुरादि। तत्र पूर्वं स्वज्ञाने चक्षुराद्यपेक्षं चक्षुरादि तु ज्ञानानपेक्षमेव ज्ञानसाधनमिति
कायनवस्था। दुभुक्त्या च तदपि शक्यज्ञानं सा च कदाचिदेव कश्चिदिति नानवस्था। Vāchaspati,
Tūtparyatikā on Sūtra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

cognition, and then the validity of the proof offered and so forth. Nor can we point to any other end of practical activity in our life, for the sake of which we are bound to pass through the infinite process of reasoning in order to prove one pramāna by another. Hence we conclude that one perception or inference is established by another perception, etc., but that there is in our life no occasion for *argumentum ad infinitum*.¹

From the above discussion of the Naiyāikas' method of establishing the validity of a pramāna it will appear that the Naiyāikas are unrelenting in their zeal to prove everything by independent grounds and reasons. Nowhere in their account of pramāna do they seem to accept a pramāna as self-evident and self-proved and therefore as requiring no other proofs than itself to establish its validity. Hence the conclusion, drawn by many students of Nyāya philosophy, is that all the Naiyāikas are in favour of only proving all pramānas by independent grounds and never accept any pramāna as self-evident nor even accede to its self-evident character. That is, it has been held by many that the Naiyāikas advocate the principle of 'other-evidence' (परतः-प्रामाण्यम्) alone and reject altogether that of self-evidence (स्वतःप्रामाण्यम्) in their doctrine of pramāna.²

But this view seems to me to require some modification. In favour of this view, it may indeed be said, in the first place, that the Naiyāikas are generally in favour of adducing grounds and reasons for all the facts of knowledge without

¹ अनवस्थेति चेत्, न, रंविद्विषयनिमित्तानामुपलब्ध्या व्यवहारोपपत्तेः।...रंविद्विषयनिमित्तोपलब्धममानस्य धर्माद्यसुखाद्वर्गप्रयोजनकप्रत्ययनौकपरिवर्जनप्रयोजनस्य व्यवहार उपपद्यते। सोऽयं तावत्वेव निवर्तते, न चास्ति व्यवहारात्तरमनवस्थासाधनीयं, दैन प्रयुक्तोऽनवस्थासुपाददौतेति। Vātsyūyana-bhūṣhya on Sutra 19, An. 1, Ad. 2.

प्रमाणाप्रमेययोरुपलब्धौ सर्वो व्यवहारः सिध्यति...न त्वनवस्थासाधनीयं किञ्चित् प्रयोजनमस्ति येनायं प्रयुक्तोऽनवस्थासुपाददौतेति। तस्यात्प्रत्ययादिभिः प्रत्यक्षादीनामुपलब्धिः न ज्ञानवस्थेति। Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika on *supra*.

² Vide page 25, foot-note No 1, above.

accepting the validity of any one of them as self-evident and therefore as requiring no other independent proof. Secondly, it may be pointed out that in the account of *pramāna*, as contained in the *Nyāya Sūtras* of Gotama and the commentaries of *Vātsyāyana* and *Udyotakara*, we find everywhere the attempt to prove the validity of a *pramāna* by other independent grounds and a condemnation of the principle of self-evidence in clear and unambiguous terms.¹ All this is quite true. But in the later commentaries of *Vāchaspati Misra* and *Udayanāchārya* we meet with very clear and consistent statements showing that there are certain special forms of *pramāna* which, by their very nature, are found to be true and valid. The validity of such *pramānas* is self-evident though, wherever necessary, it may be established by other independent grounds. *Pandit Phanibhushan Tarkabāgis* in his *Nyāyadarsana* has also suggested that even the great teachers of the *Nyāya* system, who are generally in favour of proving everything by independent grounds, have admitted the self-evident character of many forms of *pramāna*, as may be gathered from the '*Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-tikā*' and other treatises.²

In the '*Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-tikā*' we find *Vāchaspati Misra* speaks of the self-evident validity of such inference as stands on grounds that produce successful action or is free from all error and inconsistency. The validity of such inference is self-evident, since it is based on a sure ground that has a true correspondence with the object to be inferred.³ In the same book *Vāchaspati Misra* mentions *Upamāna* or Comparison and the internal perception of

¹ See especially *Nyāya Sūtras* 17-19, An. 1, Ad. 2; and *Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya* and *Udyotakara's Vārttika* on the same.

² *Vide* *Pandit Phanibhushan Tarkabāgis's 'Nyāyadarsana,' Bangiya-Sāhitya-Parishat Edition, p. 7.*

³ अनुमानस्य तु प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यलिङ्गजननीत्यस्य वा निरस्तसमस्तस्यभिचारशङ्कस्य स्वत एव प्रामाण्य-
मनुमेयास्यभिचारिलिङ्गसमुत्पत्तात् । *Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā, Benares Edition, p. 9.*

conscious resemblance as a ground of inference, and suggests that the validity of these two forms of pramāna is self-evident.¹ On the other hand, the validity of sense-perception and verbal testimony is not, according to him, self-evident, since in these two cases there is no necessary relation between our cognitions and their objects, nor any cognisance of such necessary connection. In these cases we are to establish the validity of pramāna by means of the marks of 'successful action' or 'essential resemblance' to some accredited pramāna.²

In the 'Nyāya-vārttika-tātparyā-parisuddhi' ³ Udayanāchārya allows self-evident validity to all the pramānas recognised as such by Vāchaspati and adds a few more. According to him, *anuvyavasāya* or self-consciousness of what we are at first simply conscious, and *dharmiḥjñāna* or internal as well as external perception of mere existence are also to be recognised as having self-evident validity together with inference and comparison. Of course each of these self-evident pramānas may be established by other pramānas in the form of independent grounds and reasons in order to convince a person who has any doubt as to their validity. But otherwise they may be taken as self-evident and self-proved. Hence we cannot say that the Naiyāikas have never admitted the principle of self-evidence with regard to any pramāna at all. The just conclusion to be drawn from all this is that although the Naiyāikas are generally in favour of proving everything by separate and independent grounds still some of the great

¹ ज्ञानगततज्ज्ञातीयत्वलिङ्गस्याहिण्य ज्ञानस्य मानसप्रत्यक्षस्य तादृशस्यादृष्टव्यभिचारतया परितो निरस्तमसमन्विधमाशङ्क्य स्वतः प्रामाण्यमिति मानवस्था एतेनोपमानं व्याख्यातम् ।

² तज्ज्ञातव्यवशब्दविज्ञानयोर् स्वतोऽव्यभिचारयद् इति प्रवृत्तिसासर्थं तज्ज्ञातीयत्वं वा लिङ्गमद्यौ-व्यभिचाराद्यनुसरणीयम् । Vāchaspati Tātparyatikā, Ben. Edn., p. 9.

³ यद्यपि चानुमानोपमानानुव्यवसायधर्मिज्ञानानामपि प्रामाण्यं परतोऽपि शक्यमहमेव, सन्ति हि तव यथायोगं लिङ्गसादृश्यज्ञानसमुत्पत्तादीनि तज्ज्ञातीयत्वलिङ्गानि, तथापि कोष्ठगत्या स्वत एव प्रामाण्ययद्दोऽत्र सुकर इति स एव दर्शितः । विप्रतिपन्नं प्रति तु परत एव साधनौटं तदिति परमार्थः । Udayanāchārya, Nyāya-Vārttika-Tātparyā-parisuddhi, A.S.B. edn., pp. 119-20.

teachers of the Nyāya school admit that there are certain special forms of *pramāna*, the validity of which is self-evident and self-proved.

Now we pass on to the last objection. This arises from the attempt to fix the order of *pramāna* and *prameya* in the sequence of time. A *pramāna* is that which gives us a certain knowledge of objects, which are called *prameya* in relation to it. But the so-called *pramānas*,—Perception, Inference, etc.—cannot be shown to give us a certain knowledge of objects in any position which they may possibly occupy in the temporal order.¹ Thus *pramāna* cannot be said to be antecedent or prior to the objects of knowledge, for if it be prior to the objects and so exist even before those objects, then we cannot certainly say that *pramāna* is such only in relation to objects known through it. Perception, for instance, cannot be said to arise from the contact of the sense-organs with their objects.² Nor can we say that *pramāna* is posterior or subsequent to the objects of knowledge, for if the *prameya* or the object of cognition exist even before the *pramāna*, then it cannot be said to be established by means of the *pramāna*, while a *prameya* is just what is established by *pramāna*.³ Nor again can we say that *pramāna* is synchronous or simultaneous with the objects of knowledge. On this supposition there should have been no order of succession in our cognitions. As all cognitions relate to their own objects, they must have occurred simultaneously with their co-existent objects, which however is not really the case, since our cognitions are found to appear one

¹ प्रत्यक्षादीनामप्रामाण्यं वैकाल्यासिद्धिः. Nyāya Sutra 8, An. 1, Ad. 2.

² पूर्वं हि प्रमाणांसिद्धौ नेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षात् प्रत्यक्षोत्पत्तिः. Nyāya Sutra 9, An. 1, Ad. 2.
प्रमाणत्वं हि प्रमाकरणत्वम्, पूर्वं प्रमाया अभावे प्रमाकरणत्वमपि कथं स्यात्. Visvanātha,
Nyāya-Sutra-Vritti on *supra*.

³ पश्चात्सिद्धौ न प्रमाणेभ्यः प्रमेयसिद्धिः. Nyāya Sutra 10, An. 1, Ad. 2.

असति प्रमाणी केन प्रमेयमाणीऽर्थः प्रमेयः स्यात् ? प्रमाणेन खलु प्रमेयमाणीऽर्थः प्रमेयमित्येतत् सिद्ध्यति. Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya on *supra*.

after the other. Further this supposition would contradict the Nyāya view of mind as that which prevents the simultaneous appearance of many cognitions.¹ From this it has been concluded that there can be no such thing as *pramāna*, since a *pramāna* cannot give us a knowledge of objects in any order of time in relation to those objects, which however it must give in order to be *pramāna* at all.

The Naiyāikas meet this denial of *pramāna* by two lines of argument, one positive and the other negative. The denial is meant either to set aside the practicability of the *pramānas* or to prove their impossibility. To deny their practicability is to acknowledge that they are real, for we cannot have any doubt as to the practicability or otherwise of the perfectly unreal.² Further it may positively be shown that the *pramānas* are quite possible and real, despite the difficulties arising out of their relation to the temporal order.

If, on the other hand, the denial be meant to establish that the *pramānas* are so many impossibilities, then the following negative line of arguments will show that the denial itself stands self-condemned and fails to prove the desired conclusion. In the first place, the denial, when taken to disprove the *pramānas*, will itself occupy the position of a *pramāna*, since it is the ground of our knowledge of the fact that perception, inference, etc., are not valid sources of knowledge.³ But, as such, the denial is subject to all the

¹ युगपद्विज्ञी प्रत्यर्थनियतत्वात् क्रमवृत्तित्वाभावाद् बुद्धीनाम् । Nyāya Sutra 11, An. 1, Ad. 2.

व्याघातय युगपद्विज्ञानानुत्पत्तिरनसौ लिङ्गमिति । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya on *supra* containing the definition of mind as given in Nyāya Sutra 16, An. 1, Ad. 1.

² सत्त्वो निवर्तत इत्येवं बुद्ध्यान् प्रमाणान्युपगतानि भवन्ति न ह्यसतो वृत्तिनिवृत्तिर्भवतीति । Udyotakara, Nyāya-Vārttika on Sūtras 11 and 12, An. 1, Ad. 2.

अनिश्चिते च प्रामाण्ये तदतद्रूपसन्देहासि कश्चित् दुर्लभः... । Udayanāchārya, Parisuddhi.

³ अथासत्त्वो ज्ञायते, प्रमाणलक्षणे प्राप्स्यति प्रतिषेधः । प्रमाणसम्भवस्योदलम्बिहेतुत्वादिति । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya on Sūtra 11, An. 1, Ad. 2.

difficulties which are supposed to be involved in a *pramāna* by reason of its relation to the temporal order. The denial fails, because it can be neither anterior nor posterior to, nor again synchronous with the matter to be disproved by it.¹ If it be anterior to its object, then it stands aimless. If it be posterior to the object to be disproved, then it is not really the ground of disproving that object. Again if it be simultaneous with its object, then it is useless to bring forward the denial at all. The denial thus failing, perception, inference, etc., stand as valid *pramāna* as before.²

In the second place, the attempt to deny all *pramānas* is suicidal.³ An act of denial must itself be shown to be valid before we can be prepared to accept or reject anything on the strength of it. But to prove the validity of such an act we require a valid ground which must be supported by certain recognised facts as examples (उदाहरणम्). This means that we must have recourse to inference, perception, etc. Hence in the absence of such *pramānas* as perception, inference, etc., the very act of the denial of *pramāna* would be a rash and unwise course to follow.⁴ If, on the other hand, the act of denial be validated by good grounds which are supported by observed examples, then at least the act of denial together with the inference and perception involved in it, is recognised as valid *pramāna*. If so, there is no reason why validity should be denied to the same inference and perception when these are employed by any person other than the objector

¹ तैकाख्यासिद्धेः प्रतिषेधानुपपत्तिः । Nyāya Sutra 12, An. 1, Ad. 2.

² पूर्वं हि प्रतिषेधसिद्धावसति प्रतिषेध्ये किमनेन प्रतिषिध्यते ।...प्रतिषेधलक्षणे च वाक्येऽनुपपद्यमाने सिद्धं प्रत्यक्षादीनां प्रामाण्यमिति । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya on *supra*.

³ सर्वप्रमाणप्रतिषेधाच्च प्रतिषेधासिद्धिः । Nyāya Sutra 13, An. 1, Ad. 2.

⁴ तैकाख्यासिद्धेरित्यस्य हेतोर्द्व्युदाहरणमुपादीयते हेत्वर्थस्य साधकत्वं दृष्टान्ते दर्शयितव्यम् । न च तर्हि प्रत्यक्षादीनामप्रामाण्यम् Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya on *supra*.

himself.¹ This is the Naiyāikas' *reductio ad absurdum* of scepticism.

So much for the negative line of arguments showing that the attempt to deny the validity of all pramāṇas is itself involved in insuperable difficulties. Now the following positive line of arguments will go to show that the validity of pramāṇa is in no way affected by the difficulties raised in the above objection. In the objection it is contended that there can be no pramāṇa since it cannot have a definite relation of priority or posteriority or simultaneity with the objects of knowledge. But this contention rests on a misconception regarding the time-relations between the pramāṇa and the prameya. Instead of saying that the pramāṇa is always prior or posterior to the prameya in order of time, it would be nearer the truth to say that the pramāṇa is sometimes prior, sometimes posterior to, and sometimes simultaneous with its object, so that it may be said to be connected with the prameya in all the three orders of time but not in any one fixed order. Sometimes the means of cognition comes first and then its object as, for example, the light of the sun which is the means of our cognition of external objects, coming into existence. At other times we find that the object of cognition exists prior to the means of its cognition as when we infer the nature of a musical instrument from the peculiar timbre and pitch of its notes. Sometimes again we find that the object and the means of cognition are simultaneous as, for instance, in our knowledge of fire from smoke.²

¹ तत्प्रामाण्ये वा न सर्वप्रमाणविप्रतिषेधः । Nyāya Sutra 14, An. 1, Ad. 2.

प्रतिषेधलक्षणे स्ववाक्ये तेषामवयवाश्रितानां प्रत्यक्षादीनां प्रामाण्येऽप्यनुज्ञायमाने परवाक्येऽप्यवयवाश्रितानां प्रामाण्यं प्रसज्यते, अवशिष्टादिति । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya on *supra*.

² वैकाल्याप्रतिषेधश्च शब्दादातोयमिद्विवक्षितसिद्धिः । Nyāya Sutra 15, An. 1, Ad. 2.

उपलब्धिहेतोरुपलब्धिविषयस्य चार्थस्य पूर्वापरसहभावानियमाद् यथादर्शनं विभागवचनम् । कचिदुपलब्धिहेतुः पूर्वं पश्चादुपलब्धिविषयः ।...कचिदुपलब्धिहेतुरुपलब्धिविषयश्च सह सम्भवतः । यथा धूमे-नाग्नेर्यद्व्यवसिति । Vātsyāyanābhāṣya, 2-1-11.

Hence the relation between the *pramāna* and the *prameya* in the order of time is to be determined in one way or the other in every particular instance and according to the special circumstances of the case. We should not, as has been done in the course of the above objection, try to lay down one general or universal law of priority or posteriority that is to govern all cases of the relation between the *pramāna* and the *prameya*. *Pramāna* and *prameya* are names which are applicable to anything that satisfies the necessary conditions, no matter when and where it does so. The essential condition of a *pramāna* is that it must be the means of our right cognition of objects; hence, like cognitions, it may relate to past, present and future. A *pramāna* may thus follow on the *prameya* and still be called *pramāna* only if it is the means of our cognition of the object called *prameya*. To deny this and say that nothing can be *pramāna* unless and until it actually serves as the means of cognition, is to court practical absurdities, for it means that we cannot send for a cook unless and until the man comes and actually performs the act of cooking.¹

In fact the relation between the *pramāna* and the *prameya* is a matter more for psychological observation than for logical generalisation. We cannot logically determine which objects must always be declared *pramāna* and which else be called *prameya*. Whether an object is to be called *pramāna* or *prameya* must be ascertained by means of observation of the actual relation that it bears to our cognition. If it be related to our cognition as its means or originating ground, then it is *pramāna* in relation to that particular cognition.

¹ एवं प्रमाणप्रमेययोः पूर्वोपरसङ्गभावेऽनियते यथाऽर्थो दृश्यते, तथा विभज्य वचनीय इति ।...प्रमाणमित्ये-
तस्याः समाख्याया उपलब्धिहेतुत्वं निमित्तम् ; तस्य वैकाल्ययोगः...एवं सति भविष्यत्यस्मिन् हेतुत उपलब्धिः
प्रसास्यतेऽयमर्थः, प्रमेयमिदमित्येतत् सर्वं भवतीति । वैकाल्यानभ्यनुज्ञ ने च व्यवहारानुपपत्तिः । यथैवं नाभ्यनु-
जानीयान्, तस्य पाचकमानय पत्यति,...व्यवहारो नोपपद्यत इति । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya on
Sutra 11, An. 1, Ad. 2.

If, on the other hand, it stands as the object of our cognitive knowledge, it is prameya in relation to that particular act of knowledge. Thus the same thing may be pramāna in relation to that which is cognised by means of it, and prameya in relation to what is the means of its own cognition, just as a scale is pramāna and prameya in relation respectively to objects measured by it and objects measuring it so as to test its correctness.¹ The self is prameya when it is the object of philosophical knowledge, it is pramāna when it stands as the independent subject of cognition. So also our intellect is both pramāna and prameya in so far as it is both the means and the object of our cognitions at different times.

That different concepts are applicable to the same thing may be made clearer in the light of the philosophy of Grammar. In Grammar we find that different *kārakas* or case-relations are applied to the same thing because of the concurrence of their respective grounds in relation to it. Thus the same tree is in the nominative case with reference to its independent existence, in the objective case with reference to its perception by an intelligent subject, in the instrumental case with reference to the moon shown by means of it,² and so forth.³ A *kāraka* or case-relation is a name given not to a mere thing, nor to a mere action as such, but to that which either produces some action or has a definite relation to some action, so that the *kāraka* of a thing is to be

¹ प्रमेयता च तुलाप्रमाणवत् । Nyāya Sutra 16, An. 1, Ad. 2.

² N. B.—This refers to one of the popular maxims of logic, known as 'Sākhachāndra-nyāya.' It is used in such cases in which we ascertain one thing by means of another in the same way in which the moon is shown to a man by first directing the line of his vision towards the branch of a tree which is approximately in the same line with the moon.

³ तथा च कारकशब्दा निमित्तवशात् समावेशेन वर्णन इति । वचसिष्ठोति स्वस्थितौ स्वावकाशात् कर्ता...इत्यधिकरणम् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya, 2-1-16.

determined by what it does or helps to do. Hence it follows that the same thing may be of different *kāraṅkas* according to its different actions or different relations to one action. Now *pramāṇa* and *prameya* are words expressive of case-relation, *kāraṅkas* and, like *kāraṅkas*, they are applicable to the same thing according to its different functions. Thus perception, inference, etc., may be *pramāṇa* as the means of cognition and *prameya* as the object of it.¹ We recognise them as *pramāṇa* when we say that we know this object by perception or inference, etc., and we take them as *prameya* when we say that our knowledge is perceptual or inferential, etc., or when we define and describe them. *Pramāṇa* and *prameya* being thus relative to functional activity it is useless to make them absolute terms and then try to find out whether the one is always prior or posterior to the other. Such a task is impossible not because it is too difficult for us but because there can be no such task at all.

§ 6. *Comment and Comparative Study.*

A few words of comment seem to be necessary before we leave this subject of enquiry. The Naiyāika account of *pramāṇa*, it will be seen, has the merit of suggesting a right conception of the process of knowledge and of truth. According to it, the process of knowledge is not merely a cognitive or intellectual function in which we passively allow ourselves to be impressed by external objects, so that the final outcome of this process is the production of mental images or ideas which are purely representative of the objects cognised by us. Far from this being so, it would show that

¹ न द्रव्यमात्रं कारकं न क्रियामात्रम् । क्रियासाधनं क्रियाविशेषयुक्तं कारकम् । कारकशब्दश्चायं प्रमाणं प्रमेयमिति, स च कारकधर्मो न हातुमर्हति । अस्मिन् च कारकशब्दानां निमित्तवशात् समावेशः । प्रत्यक्षादीनि च प्रमाणानि उपलब्धिहेतुत्वात्, प्रमेयस्योपलब्धिविषयत्वात् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya on Sūtra 16, An. 1, Ad. 2.

the process of knowledge involves all the three aspects of our mental life. According to it, the subject of knowledge is not a mere aggregate or series of conscious states and processes, which is only acted on and determined by the impressions of external objects but does not itself determine the course of sense-impressions nor act on external objects through the medium of the organism, as has been held by the extreme empiricists, sensationalists and materialists in the history of western philosophy. Rather it is a conscious agent who receives sense-impressions, knows external objects through them and acts on things according to his subjective purposes.¹ So likewise the process of knowledge is first a cognitive function or a mode of the intellect, by means of which we have an apprehension or presentation of external objects. Secondly, it involves an element of affection or feeling in the form of desire or aversion, according as the objects of cognition are pleasurable or painful. Lastly, it leads to a process of the will or volition in the form of active striving in order to obtain pleasurable objects and avoid painful ones.²

Hence the process of knowledge is at once a cognitive and conative function, a process of the intellect and of the will, which is mediated, in every case, by a process of feeling in the specific forms of desire, aversion, etc. In any particular act of knowledge there is not only a cognition or mental representation of the objects known, but there is at the same time an active attitude of desire or aversion in relation to them, which subsequently leads to certain overt

¹ यस्येसाजिहासाप्रयुक्तस्य प्रवृत्तिः, स प्रमाता। Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya.

इच्छाहेषप्रयवमुखदुःखज्ञानात्मकानो लिङ्गमिति। Nyāya Sutra 10, An. 1, Ad. 1.

² प्रमाणेन स्वस्वार्थं ज्ञाताऽर्थसुपलभ्य तमर्थमभीप्सति जिहासति वा। तस्येसाजिहासाप्रयुक्तस्य समीहा प्रवृत्तिरित्युच्यते...। समीहमानस्तमर्थमभीप्सन् जिहासन् वा तमर्थमाप्नोति जहाति वा। ज्ञानादनुकूलेषु रागः, प्रतिकूलेषु द्वेषः। रागद्वेषाधिकारात्...दीर्घैः प्रयुक्तः शरीरेषु प्रवर्तमानः...वाच्यति। Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya on Nyāya-Sutras, and 2, An. 1, Ad. 1.

movements in order to obtain or avoid them.¹ In knowledge we do not only cognise an object but also propose to act in a certain way in relation to it. This means that in every process of cognition there is an element of feeling and conation, that in all intellectual functions there is an aspect of affection and volition—a fact which follows naturally from the unity of our mental life and the law of the relativity of consciousness.

This truth has been well brought out by Prof. Royce when he observes “that your intelligent ideas of things never consist of mere images of things, but always involve a consciousness of how you propose to act towards the things of which you have ideas. A sword is an object that you would propose to use or to regard in one way, while a pen is to be used in another. Your idea of your friend differs from your idea of your enemy by virtue of your consciousness of your different attitude and intended behaviour towards, these objects.”² Prof. Stout also has very well observed “apperception is conative process. A mental group or system is a grouped or systematised tendency, and the union of such groups or systems is the confluence of different modes of mental activity.”³

It is still more interesting to note here the Naiyāika conception of Truth. According to this, truth is primarily a matter of intellectual consistency or the consistency between ideas and objects. In every act of true knowledge there must be a right cognition of objects, due to a valid and an appropriate source, as well as an accurate representation of the nature and attributes of the objects so known.⁴ This

¹ प्रवृत्तिर्वाङ्मनोवृत्तिर्यदोपायः इति। Nyāya Sutra 17, An. 1, Ad. 1.

² Royce, *The World and the Individual*, First Series, Lecture I, pages 20 and 22.

³ Stout, *Analytic Psychology*, Vol. II, Chapter VIII, p. 114.

⁴ यथावर्तोऽनुमपः प्रमा। Udayanāchārya, *Tātparyaparisuddhi*.
यदर्थविज्ञानं स। प्रवृत्तिः। Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya.

then means that in true knowledge our ideas must submit to an objective standard of facts which are relatively independent of our individual or subjective will and purpose.¹ Of course, the necessary presupposition of such an objective standard is an absolute system of things, a fixed and stable order of contents of the world, to which our ideas must correspond if they are to be regarded as true and valid. In the Nyāya system there is the recognition of such a fixed order of things, a permanent system of objects, a rational cosmos which reveals the wise purposes and the creative energies of the supreme person, namely, God.² Hence the fact remains that from the Naiyāika standpoint there is a just recognition of the objectivity of Truth and Knowledge, based consistently on such psycho-metaphysical grounds as provide a strong safeguard against the inaccuracies and inadvertencies of extreme subjectivism and radical pragmatism.

In such cases in which the objects of knowledge are supersensible, so that the correspondence of our ideas to them cannot be verified by direct experience, the Naiyāikas would advise us to determine the validity of our knowledge of such supersensible objects by its reference to and essential resemblance with some other accredited knowledge in which the correspondence between ideas and objects has been previously verified by experience.³ Even in such cases, the Naiyāikas would offer the test of valid analogical reasoning to ascertain the truth of our knowledge and resolutely decline to accept our ideas as true simply on the ground of their utility or serviceableness in practicable life or of our "will to

¹ *Vide* Nyāya-Sutras 4-2-26 ff. directed against the subjective Idealism of the Yogācāra Buddhists.

² *Vide* Nyāya Sutras 19-21, An. 1, Ad. 4; and Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya, Visvanātha's Vṛitti, etc., on the same.

³ एवं च दृष्टार्थमन्वयैर्दृष्टप्रमाणैः प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्येनावधार्यं तच्चातीत्युदाहरणस्य वेदस्य विनापि प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यं प्रामाण्यावधारणमनोक्तत्वेन । Vāchaspati, Tātparyatikā on Nyāya Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

believe" as has been done by the pragmatic thinkers of the West. In respect of the objectivity of truth, therefore, the Naiyāikas agree more with the realists than with pragmatists in the history of western philosophy inasmuch as, with the realists, they allow independent existence to objects in relation to our ideas and carefully oppose the pragmatic modes of verification by operation, sentiment and general utility as the sole grounds for proving the validity of our knowledge.¹ But, as we shall see next, the Nyāya account of Truth includes other aspects which do not come within the purview of western realism.

From the Nyāya standpoint, Truth is not a matter of mere intellectual consistency and pure objectivity. It is indeed undeniable that in knowledge our ideas must correspond to objects which are independent of the ideas. But this independent existence of objects has an aspect of value and an adaptation to our pleasure and pain, so that the objective existence of things is not totally indifferent but has an essential relation to our subjective needs and purposes.² Hence in true knowledge there is not only an intellectual consistency between ideas and objects but, as further evidence of this consistency, a harmony between ideas, on the one hand, and the actions inspired by these ideas and their results on the other. An act of knowledge must not only satisfy the intellect's demand for self-consistency and consistency to facts but must also lead to successful practice in life, to conative satisfaction, to a harmony of reactions following on intellectual consistency. Here then we have a happy combination of western rationalism and pragmatism in respect of the conception of Truth. In it the Naiyāika, like the rationalists, accepts the marks of the self-consistency of ideas

¹ Vide Perry's 'Present Philosophical Tendencies,' Parts IV and V.

² अर्थज्ञ सुखं सुखहेतुः दुःखं दुःखहेतुश्च । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya on Sutra 1, An. 1, Ad. 1.

among themselves and their correspondence to objective facts, as the primary and the fundamental aspect of truth. But with this primary aspect, the Naiyāika, like the pragmatist, connects another essential feature of true knowledge, namely, that it leads to successful activity or useful practice in life.

It is, however, by no means true that the attainment of any useful result is the conative satisfaction herein mentioned, nor is it a sign of there being true knowledge as the basis of that attainment. To say that it is so is to ignore the evidence of our common experience, which testifies to the possibility of many useful results following even on an erroneous conception of things. It would also mean that one who so speaks would, like the radical pragmatists, reduce the true to the useful and cherish a fundamental misconception of the nature of truth, which has been so often branded by eminent thinkers as a perversity of reason. Hence the Naiyāika leaves us in no doubt as to the nature of the conative satisfaction that must go hand in hand with intellectual consistency in a complete conception of Truth. According to him, an idea satisfies our will and leads to successful practice only when it is true and is the condition of a valid cognition of objects, so that the idea is true not because it is useful, but it is useful because it is true.¹ In such cases in which a false idea leads to some useful result, as when a man quenches his thirst by taking a glass of impure water under the impression that it is pure, we are to say that there is not the satisfaction of that need or conative tendency which was inspired by the idea then present in the mind of the subject. Thus in the above example, there is no satisfaction of the desire for pure water and its hygienic effects, although there be one useful result, namely, the alleviation of thirst.

¹ Cf. प्रमाणतोऽर्थप्रतिपत्तौ प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यादर्थवत् प्रमाणम् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya, opening line.

Hence from the Naiyāika standpoint, conative satisfaction is a mark of true knowledge only when that satisfaction is preceded by a right cognition of objects as they actually exist.¹ Thus in knowledge and truth we must admit the claims of both the intellect and the will, and hold that intellectual consistency and conative satisfaction, submission to an objective standard and the fulfilment of subjective purposes, the objectivity of truth and its adaptation to personal values, are inseparable correlatives in one whole.

¹ प्रमाणमन्तरिणं नार्थप्रतिपत्तिः नार्थप्रतिपत्तिमन्तरिणं प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यम् । Vātsyāyana-bhāṣhya on Sutra I, An. I, Ad. I.

EARLY HISTORY OF BENGAL.

SENA PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

Political History

The subject of this thesis is the history of Bengal during the Sena rule. This includes not merely the political but also the administrative, the fiscal, the social, the religious and the literary history of the period. And although "it is the administrative, social, religious, and ethnological history which is of much greater importance and far transcends political history in point of human interest and edification,"¹ a discussion of the political history to begin with is necessary for thorough understanding and lucid treatment of the whole subject.


It is true that no Thucydides or Tacitus has left any record of the achievements of the people of ancient India, or any Kalhana, a history of Bengal during the Sena rule. The latter is therefore still a desideratum. But the researches of a multitude of scholars in this field have disclosed an unexpected wealth of materials for the reconstruction of this history. These materials mainly fall into two classes, *viz.* (1) epigraphic records, (2) literary works. Epigraphic records consist of inscriptions found of almost all the rulers of this dynasty.

Literary works consist of the *Vallūlacharita* by one Ānandabhaṭṭa, a writer of the fifteenth century, the *Dāna-sāgara* composed by king Vallābasena himself, the *Adbhūta-sāgara*, a manual begun by Vallāla but finished by his son Lakshana, the *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva, the *Pavanadūta* of Dhoyi, the *Āryāsaptasatī* of Āchārya Govardhana, the

¹ *The Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, p. 1.

Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva of Halāyudha, the *Sadukti-karṇāmṛta* or *Śuktikarṇāmṛta* of Śrīdharadāsa and a host of other writings quoted in this last work.

By carefully sifting the evidence and skilfully marshalling the facts disclosed by these records it is possible to construct a fairly good and all-round history of the period. But as stated above we will begin first with the political history for which we are indebted mainly to the epigraphic records. These documents reveal the following line of succession in the Sena dynasty of Bengal :—



The Senas of Bengal claim descent from the lunar race and are said to have originally belonged to the South.¹ In the Mādhāinagar grant² of Lakshmaṇa it is said that Sāmanta was 'the head-garland of the Karṇāṭa Kshatriyas.' In the fifth verse of the Deopara inscription³ Sāmanta is said to have been "the head-garland of the clans of the *Brahma-kshatriyas*." A lively discussion has centred round the term *Brahma-*

¹ Deopara Inscription, V. 4. Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 305.

² J. A. S. B., Vol. V, 1909, p. 467 ff.

p. Ind., Vol. I, p. 305.

kshatriyas. Prof. Kielhorn translates the phrase, *Brahma-kshatriyāṇām kulasirodāma* as “the head-garland of the clans of the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas.” In some passages no doubt we find the term *Brahmakshatra* used in the sense of “the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas” as taken by Prof. Kielhorn. Thus we find *Brāhmakshatram-ahimsantah te keśam samapūrayan*¹ and again *pañcha pañchanakhā bhakshyā Brahmakshatreṇa Rāghava*.² But another sense of the term is also known, namely, that of a person born of a Brāhmaṇa and Kshatriya parentage especially in the genealogical accounts of the *Bhāgavata*³ and the *Vishṇupurāṇa*. But though the term had hitherto been a prolific source of puzzle and confusion, it is no longer so after the publication of the essay on the “Guhilots”⁴ by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar. Here I cannot do better than quote one passage from his article. “We have already seen that a Chātsu inscription speaks of a Guhilot king Bhartrbhaṭṭa as *Brahmakshatr-ānvita*, which I have translated by possessed of (both) priestly and martial energy, but a foot-note has been added below saying that what is also implied is that Bhartrbhaṭṭa was a Brahmakshatri. Bhartrbhaṭṭa is not the only ancient king of India who is so called. In the Deopara inscription of Vijayasena of the well-known Sena dynasty of Bengal Sāmantasena is described as *Brahma-kshatriyāṇām kulasiro-dāma*, which expression was rendered by Prof. Kielhorn by “head-garland of the clans of the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas,” but which ought to have been rendered, I think, by “head-garland of the Brahmakshatri family.” That the latter is the correct translation is shown by the term *Brahmakshatra* used with reference to the Sena kings in the *Ballālacharitaṃ*. Now there is a caste called Brahmakshatri corresponding to this Brahmakshatra, the members of

¹ Rāmāyaṇa, Vālakāṇḍa, 13, 7.

² Rāmāyaṇa, Kishkindhyākāṇḍa, 39, 17.

³ 9 Skandha, 22 Adhyāya, 44 Sloka.

⁴ 4th Aṃsa.

⁵ J. & Proc. A. S. B., Vol. V, 1909, p. 186.

which are found all over the Punjab, Rajputana, Kathiawar, Gujarat and even the Deccan. In my opinion as already stated, they were originally the Brāhmaṇa classes of new tribes afterwards turned Kshatriyas, before their final merging into the Hindu society." Thus when the Sena kings in their records are said to have belonged to the Brahmakshatra family all that we have to understand is that they were originally Brāhmaṇas but were Kshatriyas at the time when they came into historic importance. The members of the Brahmakshatri caste are found even to this day but are confined exclusively to the western part of India, and if any Brahmakshatri family came to Bengal in the 10th century A.D. they must naturally have come from the west. And this is just the reason why the Senas of Bengal who were Brahmakshatris are said to have come from Karpāṭa which certainly is a part of Western India. So far in regard to the term Brahmakshatra. Now the question arises, if the Senas came from the west and specially from the Karpāṭa country, is there any trace of the name Sena in the records found in the Canarese-speaking district? In this connection are worth noting the researches of Dr. R. C. Majumdar who embodied their results in the shape of an article called the "Origin of the Sena Kings" which he read before the Second Oriental Conference. He says, "The epigraphic records of Southern India introduce us to a line of Jaina teachers whose names end in the surname Sena."¹ And he gives the following line of teachers in the Sena family of Dharwar district.²

Kumārasena.			
Virasena	c. 850-903 A.D.
Kanakasena			
Ajitasena	c. 950-975 A.D.
Brahmasena			
Āryasena	c. 1000-1054 A.D.
Mahāsena			

¹ Proceedings and Transactions of Second Oriental Conference (1922), p. 343.

² *Ibid*, p. 343.

Then a little further on he says, "There are clear references in the inscriptions of the Sena kings of Bengal that their forefathers were religious teachers. Thus Sāmantasena is called a Brahmayādī in the 5th Verse of the Deopara inscription and the epithet '*acharama-param-ātma-jñāna-bhīṣhmād*' is applied to him in the tenth verse. The fact that Sāmantasena retired to a hermitage in his old age may not also be without significance." ¹ Then after a few lines he proceeds: "The fact that the Senas of Dharwar were Jainas while the Sena kings of Bengal were Śaivas need not stand in the way of the proposed identification. It is a well-known fact that in the 11th and 12th centuries A.D. there was a religious revolution in Kārṇāṭa in favour of Śaivism which ultimately culminated in the establishment of the Viraśaiva or the Liṅgāyat sect. A notable instance of the conversion from Jainism to the Śaiva faith is furnished by the Western Chālukya king Jayasimha II Jagadekamalla who ruled from 1018 to 1042 A.D. It is not impossible that the conversion of the ruling dynasty to the Śaiva faith might have influenced some members of the Sena family to embrace the new creed." ²

The most important fact to note here is that the surname Sena was prevalent in the country of Kārṇāṭa and for this our thanks are due to Dr. Majumdar. But it is somewhat difficult to follow him when he says that apparently all the Senas of Kārṇāṭa were originally of Jaina faith just because some Jaina teachers bear the surname Sena and that they were subsequently converted to the Śaiva religion when the Viraśaiva or the Liṅgāyat sect sprang into existence. Change of religion especially from Hinduism to Jainism or *vice versa* is not unknown to this day and certainly was not unknown to Kārṇāṭa about the eleventh century A.D. All that we need pay attention to is that the surname Sena was by no means unknown to Kārṇāṭa and this exactly agrees with the fact

¹ *Ibid*, pp. 344-45.

² *Ibid*, p. 345.

that the Senas originally hailed from that country as their records unanimously tell us.

Thus there is no doubt about the fact that the Senas came from the South originally. But how a chief admittedly of Karṇāṭaka origin came to wield political power in Bengal is still a mystery. Various theories have been propounded by various scholars and various guesses and surmises have been indulged in, but none of them is satisfactory. According to Mr. R. D. Banerjee¹ some of the ancestors of the Senas accompanied Rājendra Chola in one of his expeditions to Bengal and carved out a principality there. Mr. R. P. Chanda, on the other hand, is inclined to take the view that one of the forefathers of the Senas of Bengal accompanied Chālukya Vikramāditya in one of his expeditions to Gauda and Kāmarūpa and with the help of the Chālukya king he held the Bengal principality and that "Sāmantasena born in the family of the princes of Karṇāṭa Kshatriyas was engaged in fighting out the enemies of the Karṇāṭa Raj in the Rādhā country."² The view of Dr. Majumdar though slightly different is practically the same. He holds that not one of the ancestors of Sāmantasena but Sāmantasena himself accompanied Chālukya Vikramāditya to Bengal. He says, "It is thus quite conceivable that Sāmantasena might have accompanied Vikramāditya in one of his expeditions and like Nānyadeva carved out a principality for himself in the conquered territories."³

Now it is impossible to agree with Mr. Banerjee in his views, because Rājendra Chola was a Tamil and he did not come from Karṇāṭa. The view expressed by Messrs. Chanda and Majumdar seems to be more acceptable. The only objection to their view is that Sāmantasena's activity was confined only to the southern region. He was neither engaged in fighting out the enemies of the king of Karṇāṭa and Rādhā,

¹ Bāṅglār Itihāsa.

² Gauda Rājamāla, p. 47.

³ Proceedings and Transactions of the Second Oriental Conference (1922), p. 347.

nor was the founder of the Bengal principality. In the Deopara inscription Sāmantasena is said to have carried his victorious arms as far as Adam's bridge (V. 5), and to have "singly slaughtered the wicked robbers of the wealth of Karṇāṭa overrun by hostile tribes, to such an extent, that the ruler of goblins, whose citizens are delighted, does not even now leave the Southern quarter where the ample store of marrow, flesh and fat is not yet exhausted" (V. 8). If Sāmantasena was already a ruler in Bengal, it is very strange that no victory of his in East India has been recorded. And as all his achievements refer to South India only, the natural inference is that he was in Karṇāṭa and not in Bengal.

But the other part of their view is worth acceptance, for the Chālukya king Vikramāditya was a ruler of Karṇāṭa. He also is reported to have invaded Bengal¹ and he flourished from 1076 to 1126 A.D. This brings us so close to the time of the founder of the Sena dynasty, whoever he was, that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Senas came into Bengal in the victorious march of this Western Chālukya King to East India. But it is worthy of note that we find the Senas for the first time stationed not only in the Rāḍhā country but also in Magadha for we have epigraphic records at Bodh-Gayā and palm-leaf manuscripts in Nepal which together reveal a line of kings not only called Sena and coming from Karṇāṭa but also ruling over Behar synchronously. This seems to show that when Vikramāditya VI conquered Gauḍa, he left garrisons of Karṇāṭa warriors—one in Rāḍhā and the other in the Magadha province.

Let us now see how the Sena dynasty came to rule over Bengal. These Senas, we are told, were confined originally to the Rāḍhā country which as we know corresponds to West Bengal. East Bengal seems to have been ruled over about this time by a line of Kings who called themselves Varmans,

¹ Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part II, p. 442.

as is clear from the Belava copper plate of Bhojavarman¹ who was reigning at Vikrampur. We have already seen that Sāmantasena was in no way connected with any part of Bengal. It is no doubt said of him in the Deopara inscription that when he retired from worldly life he was settled on the Banks of the Ganges. As his kinsmen had already been garrisoned in the Rādhā province as the Naihati grant of Vallālasena clearly informs us, one may perhaps infer that when Sāmantasena retired he was living somewhere in that province on the banks of the holy river. But there is no reason to connect him politically with any part of Bengal.

Sāmantasena's son was Hemantasena. But nothing of any importance has been recorded about him.

Hemantasena.

Hemantasena's son was Vijayasena who appears to have been not only the first Sena who made himself an independent ruler, but was also the first of his dynasty to rule over a large part if not the whole of Bengal. The Deopara inscription of this king gives us an account of his magnificent achievements and victorious career. It is stated there that he defeated Nānya and Vīra, assailed the lord of Gauḍa, put down the prince of Kāmarūpa, defeated the Kālīṅga (king), imprisoned a number of princes including Rāghava and Vardhana and sent a naval expedition towards the west up the whole course of the Ganges (V. 20-22).

Vijayasena.

Though there is considerable difficulty in identifying these defeated kings owing to the fact that the two inscriptions mentioned above do not, like the Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta, connect these kings with the countries they ruled, the researches of some scholars have done much to illuminate the darkness around them. But before any attempt is made at their identification it is necessary to have at least a rough idea of the time of Vijayasena.

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 40.

Now it is a well-known fact that Vallālasena was the author of at least two works called the *Dānasāgara* and the *Adbhūtasāgara*. The first of those he was able to complete but the second was continued after his death and brought to a finish by his son Lakshmaṇa. This latter, *i.e.*, the *Adbhūtasāgara*, has a verse, ‘*bhūje-Vasu daśamite Śake śrīmad-Vallālasena-rājyādaṁ*,’ to which the late Rai Monomohan Chakravarti Bahadur was the first to draw our attention. The line clearly tells us that Śaka 1082 or A.D. 1159-60, was the initial year of Vallāla’s reign. Again in the Barrackpur grant of Vijayasena there is a date which has been read by Mr. R. D. Banerji as Sam. 32,¹ but a glance even at Bühler’s chart will show that the two figures on the printed plate published by Mr. Banerjee cannot by any means be thought to resemble 3 and 2 respectively. An attempt to decipher the date has recently been made by Mr. N. K. Bhattasali² and Babu Dineshchandra Bhattacharya, M.A.,³ apparently independently of each other, and they both agree in reading the date as 61, which, though it is not as certain as desirable, is at any rate far more probable than that read by Mr. Banerjee. No doubt, if their view be accepted, Vijaya must be credited with having enjoyed an exceptionally long reign of at least 61 years. But this is by no means an absolute improbability in Indian History. Choragaṅga, the contemporary of Vijayasena⁴ ruled even for 71 years⁵ (1076-1147 A.D.). Thus we may approximately fix the earlier limit of Vijayasena’s reign about 1099 A.D. (1160-61=A.D. 1099), that is about the beginning of the twelfth century A.D.

Having thus determined the date of Vijaya, we shall now proceed to identify his contemporaries. Nānya and Rāghava

¹ J. A. S. B., 1906, p. 11 footnote.

² J. & Proc. A. S. B., Vol. XVII, 1921, p. 16 footnote.

³ Ind. Ant., August, 1922, p. 157.

⁴ Vallālacharitam (Bibliotheca Indica).

⁵ J. A. S. B., 1903, p. 101.

have been identified by Babu Manmohan Chakravarti respectively with Nānyadeva ¹ of Mithilā, and Rāghava ² king of Kalinga, son of Choragaṅga. The identification of Nānya rests on a statement of Vidyāpati. In the Yuddhavira, one of the tales of the *Purushaparīkshā* of Vidyāpati it is stated that king Nānyadeva of Karṇāṭakula ruled in Mithilā and had a son named Malladeva who took service under Jayachandra, king of Kānyakubja and Kāśī, and died at the age of sixteen. In another tale of the same work this Jayachandra is said to have been defeated and killed in war with Shāhabuddin by the treachery of his queen. As we know from Mahomedan History that Jayachand, king of Kanauj, was defeated by Shahabuddin in A.D. 1194 and also as we have several inscriptions coming from Kānyakubja and Kāśī and ranging between 1170 and 1188 A.D. and bearing the name of Jayachandra, we may be certain that Vidyāpati has introduced in his narratives really historical persons. Now as the young son of Nānyadeva has been made contemporary of this Jayachandra, we may hold that Nānyadeva flourished in his time or a little earlier, say, in the third quarter of the twelfth century A.D.³ This date for Nānyadeva of Mithila makes it almost certain that he is the Nānya spoken of in the Deopara inscription.⁴ As has been already remarked, Rāghava of the Deopara inscription has been identified by Manomohan Chakravarti with Rāghava king of Kalinga and son of Choragaṅga. In the *Ballālacharita* of Ānandabhaṭṭa Vijayasena is said to have been a friend of Choragaṅga. Manomohan Babu has assigned king Rāghava of Kalinga to

¹ J. A. S. B., 1915, pp. 408-9.

² J. A. S. B., 1903, pp. 101-13.

³ J. A. S. B., 1915, pp. 408-9.

⁴ Prof. Kielhorn in his paper on the Deopara Inscription has identified Nānya with Nānyadeva, the founder of the Karṇāṭaka dynasty of Nepal and placed him in Śaka 1019 or A. D. 1097. It seems that Nānyadeva, the founder of Karṇāṭaka dynasty of Nepal, and Nānyadeva mentioned in the *Purushaparīkshā* are the same person, for the Nānyadeva of Vidyāpati is also said to have belonged to the Karṇāṭaka dynasty.

the period ranging between A.D. 1156 and 1170. And as according to our calculation, Vijayasena reigned from 1099 to 1160 A.D. he must have been a contemporary of Rāghava for sometime at least.

As regards Vira and Vardhana, they have been identified by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri respectively with Viraguna of Koṭāṭavi and Vardhana of Koṣāmbī from a statement of Sandhyākaranandī in the *Rāmacharitam* to the effect that these two kings as well as Vijayadeva of Nidrāvala helped Rāmapāla in regaining Varendrī.¹ This identification of Viraguna and Vardhana rests evidently on the determination of the time of Rāmapāla. If his time can be fixed near about the time of Vijayasena, the identification of Vira and Vardhana may be accepted. Now according to both Dr. R. C. Majumdar² and Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri⁴ the time of Rāmapāla falls in the closing years of the 11th century and the earlier years of the twelfth. This can be made out thus : The Sarnath inscription of Mahipāla I gives a known date for him, 1026 A.D. His son Nayapāla ruled at least for 15 years and Nayapāla's son Vighrapāla for at least 13 years. The reigning periods of Vighrapāla's two sons Mahipāla II and Sūrapāla II are not known but let us suppose that they ruled for a and b years respectively. After them came the three Kaivarta kings Divvoka, Rudaka and Bhīma whose unknown reigning periods let us represent by c , d , and e respectively. Finally came Rāmapāla who ruled for at least 42 years. Thus the date for Rāmapāla would be $1026 + 15 + 13 + a + b + c + d + e + 42 = 1096 + a + b + c + d + e$. The value of a to e is, as has been pointed out, not known. But we shall not be far from right if we place Rāmapāla in the first quarter of the twelfth century A.D. Rāmapāla must therefore have been a contemporary of Vijayasena. Therefore

¹ Ind. Ant., 1922, pp. 174-175.

² J. A. S. B., 1921, p. 6.

³ Ind. Ant., 1920, p. 175.

as we see that the reigning period of Rāmapāla coincides with the time of Vijaya we may take the identification of Vira and Vardhana of the Deopara inscription with Viraguṇa of Koṭāṭavī and Vardhana of Kośāmbī as almost certain.¹ We have so far been able to identify four kings, Nānya Rāghava, Vīra and Vardhana and there remain two more kings to be identified. They are the king of Gauḍa and the prince of Kāmarūpa. According to V.A. Smith, the king of Gauḍa was 'either Rāmapāla or his son Kumārapāla, more likely the latter.'² But it seems that the king of Gauḍa defeated by Vijaya was neither Rāmapāla nor Kumārapāla but Madanapāla the second son of Rāmapāla and the third king in order from Kumārapāla. Neither Rāmapāla nor Kumārapāla was the last king of his dynasty. The Manahali grant of Madanapāla proves that he was the master of Varendrī in his eighth regnal year. In that year he made some land-grant in the Puṇḍravardhanabhukti which certainly included Varendrī. Madanapāla was surely the last king of his dynasty who wielded any political power. It is as yet, not definitely known who was the successor of Madanapāla. Thus there is a strong possibility that Madanapāla was the king of Gauḍa referred to in the Deopara inscription. The date of the accession of Madanapāla which according to the chronology³ of Prof. R. C. Majumdar is A.D. 1130, makes him also a contemporary of Vijayasena.

The prince of Kāmarūpa was most probably some ancestor of Vallabhadeva, perhaps his grandfather Rāyārideva.

¹ Dr. V. A. Smith has tried to identify Vira with a King of Assam on the authority of a legend dated Saka 1111 (A. D. 1189) and on the mention of a king of Kāmarupa named Viravāhu "whose son became powerful king" in an undated copper plate. But his view can no longer be tenable in presence of the statement in the Rāmācharita. Moreover no reliance can be placed on a mere legend. The undated copper plate in which the name Viravāhu occurs and which is mentioned by him, has been found from the reference given by him to be the Nowgong copper plate of Balavarman. According to Dr. Hoernle, the editor of this grant, the inscription "was probably prepared about 990 A.D." So Viravāhu cannot be the Vira of Deopara Inscription.

² E. H. I., p. 419.

³ J. & Proc. A. S. B., Vol. XVII, 1921, p. 6 ff.

From a copper plate inscription of Vallabhadeva, dated Saka 1107 (1184-85 A.D.) we know that the armies from the Gaudadeśa invaded Kāmarūpa during the time of Rāyārideva.¹ There is a considerable difficulty in identifying Sāhasaṅka. Mr. R. D. Banerjee² has cited the names of some four or five kings whose *biruda* was Sāhasaṅka : but none of them can be placed in our period.

The time when Vijaya flourished was exceptionally favourable for an adventurous and war-like king like him. The mighty fabric of the Pāla empire after lasting for more than three centuries had at last begun to fall to pieces. The first sign of its decay was seen in the revolt of the Kaivarta king Divvoka. Though Rāmapāla had succeeded after a mighty attempt to restore his kingdom from the clutches of the third Kaivarta king Bhīma, he was the last great king of his dynasty. His successors were probably not so strong as he was. After Rāmapāla followed a very troublous time in Bengal and taking advantage of this unsettled condition the Varmans asserted their supremacy in East Bengal³ and Vijaya who was already settled in Nidrāval (a place somewhere in Bengal), and who at one time, according to Sandhyākara-nandī, the author of the Rāmacharita helped Rāmapāla in regaining his kingdom⁴ snatched away Varendrī probably from the hand of Madanapāla after the latter had been on the throne for eight years. But it seems that Vijaya was not the only prince who had an eye upon the rich kingdom of Gauda, but Nānya, the king of Mithilā, Rāghava, the king of Kaliṅga, the prince of Kāmarūpa, Vardhana of Kośāmbī⁴ and Viraguṇa of Koṭāṭavi, each and all fought to have a share in the kingdom of Bengal and so in the course of maturing

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. V, p. 184.

² Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, 1913-14, p. 37 ff.

³ For the identification of Vijaya of Nidrāvala with Vijaya of the Sena dynasty, please see Appendix D.

⁴ Ind. Ant., 1920, pp. 174-5.

their plan, they came in conflict with Vijaya, who became the favourite son of Fortune, defeated them and ultimately came out victorious from the contest. It is not impossible that Vijaya considerably strengthened his position by marrying in the ancient Sūra family of the Sūhma country. In the Barrackpur grant of Vijaya he is said to have married "Vilāsadevī, the moonlight of the Sea of the Sūra family" (V. 6). The existence of a Sūra family of Bengal is long known from the traditional account of Ādisūra who, it is said, brought five Brahmans from Kānyakubja to Bengal. The genealogical lists of the Bengal *ghaṭakas* (matchmakers), give the names of the following kings of the Sūra family :—Ādisūra, Bhūsūra, Kshitīsūra, Avaniśūra, Dhārāsūra, and lastly Raṇasūra.¹ Though the existence of Ādisūra has been doubted by scholars and on very good grounds, and though much reliance cannot be placed on the traditional accounts of the Bengal *ghaṭakas* there is sufficient ground to believe that there did exist in Bengal a line of Sūra kings. The Tirumalaya inscription of Rājendra Chola records that he defeated one Raṇasūra of Takkaṇa Lāḍam, *i.e.*, Dakṣhiṇa Rādhā.² The Dakṣhiṇa Rādhā was apparently the Sūhma country.³ Now the *Kulapañjikās* of the Bengal *ghaṭakas* also name the king Raṇasūra. When the tradition is corroborated by epigraphic evidence, there is no reason to disbelieve it. Thus there can be no doubt that there was an ancient Sūra family ruling in Southern Bengal. By marrying in this family Vijaya probably gained double advantage. First he was materially backed up in his contest by his wife's relatives and secondly, his status was raised in the eyes of the people of Bengal. While Vīra, Vardhana, Rāghava, Nānya and even the prince of Kāmarūpa were looked upon as foreigners by the people of Bengal. Vijaya who had already been in Bengal for a long

¹ J. A. S. B., Vol. IV, p. 286 footnote VII.

² Inscriptions of Southern India, Keilhorn, No. 733.

³ J. A. S. B., Vol. IV, 1908, p. 286.

time was looked upon as one of them especially by this matrimonial alliance with an ancient family of that province.

The reign of Vijaya was marked not only with wars abroad but also with works of high public utility at home. The poet Umāpatidhara has recorded of him in the Deopara inscription that he built many high and magnificent temples and excavated many spacious tanks. The beautiful and grand temple of Pradyumneśvara Śiva was built in his reign. The fine city of Vijayapura mentioned in the Pavanadūta as the capital of king Lakshmaṇa was probably built during his time and was named after him.

The king Vijaya was a worshipper of Śiva, and he styled himself as Paramamāheśvara. Two inscriptions of his open with an adoration to Śiva. Vṛshabhaśaṅkara, the *biruda* of this king, also indicates his Śaiva faith. Of Vijayasena the following two inscriptions have so far been found :—

I. The Deopara stone inscription. Deopara is a village in the Rajshahi district, a few miles west of the town of Rampur Boalia. The object of the grant is to record the fact that Vijaya built a high and magnificent temple of Śiva under the name of Pradyumneśvara. The inscription was composed by the poet Umāpatidhara “whose understanding is purified by the study of words and their meaning.” It was carefully and beautifully engraved by Rāṇaka Śulapāṇi, the crest-jewel of the guild of Varendra artists. The inscription is not dated.¹

II. The Barrackpur grant. Barrackpur is a cantonment in the 24-Parganas. The grant was made in honour of lord Maheśvara for performing the *homa* ceremony by the queen of Vijayasena, the illustrious Vilāsadevī, on the occasion of a lunar eclipse. The grant was issued from the victorious camp of Vikramapura to the illustrious Udaya-karadevaśarman, a student of the Āśvalāyana Śākhā of the

¹ It was published by Prof. Keilhorn in Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 307.

Rgvēda. It is dated Samv. 61 (32 according to Mr. R. D. Banerjee).¹

Vijaya was succeeded by his son Vallāla. He came to the throne, as we have seen on the authority of the *Adbhūtasāgara*, about 1159 A. D. Nothing particularly is known about the political activities and military achievements of this king. The Naihati grant, the only inscription of his reign, as well as the grants of his successor Lakshmaṇa do not throw any light on the subject, beyond recording the fact that he was a Mahārājādhirāja or a paramount sovereign. The Madanapāda grant of Viśvarūpa, son of Lakshmaṇa, says that he was the Gauḍeśvara or lord of Gauḍa. Lord of Gauḍa he is also called at the beginning of the *Dānasāgara*. Mahamahopadhyaya Haraprasad Sastri says that with the aid of the Kaivartas, "Vallāla conquered Northern Bengal and tried his best to make a clean caste of them, and divided them by sending the more turbulent ones to defend the Southern frontier, the Dakṣiṇaghāṭa. Their leader was Maheśa whom he made a Maṇḍaleśvara from which fact the Dakṣiṇaghāṭa is still known as Maṇḍalaghāṭa."² But this statement of his rests, so far as we can find out, on the *Vallālacharita*, a work of the 15th century and based on mere tradition. Another tradition, to the effect that Vallālasena went on a conquest to Mithilā, has been made known to us by Babu Nagendranath Vasu from a passage in the *Laghubhārata* (Ch. 2, p. 140). The *Vallālacharita*, however, says that king Vallāla was actually the ruler of Mithilā.³ According to various traditions current in Bengal, Vallāla was the founder of Kulinism and the reorganiser of the caste-system. The old *Kārikā* of Harimiśra for instance, records that "he honoured the Brahmanas with

¹ The grant is published by Mr. R. D. Banerjee in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XV, p. 156.

² Introduction (p. 15), to N. N. Vasu's 'Modern Buddhism and its followers in Orissa.'

³ *Vallālacharita*, p. 16.

the superior rank of Kaulinya—a rank the equal of which is rarely to be met with in this world”¹ The *Vallālacharita* gives a detailed account of his in this connection. We will have occasion to appraise the value of these traditions, when we treat of the Social History of the Sena period.

Vallāla was a man of letters. It is stated in the beginning of the *Dānasāgara* that he learnt all the *Purāṇas* and the *Smṛti* works from his preceptor Aniruddha.² He was the author, as we have already remarked, of two encyclopaedic works, the *Dānasāgara* and the *Adbhūtasāgara*. The former was completed in Saka 1091 or 1169-70 A. D. while the latter was begun by him in A. D. 1168-69. This latter work (*i.e.*, the *Adbhūtasāgara*), however, he could not carry to completion and it was finished only after his death by his son Lakshmaṇa.

Vallāla was, like his illustrious father, Vijaya, a Śaiva by faith. His grant opens with an invocation to Śiva and he styles himself a Paramamāheśvara and takes the *biruda* Nihśankaśankara. But according to Babu Nagendranath Vasu, he was a Tāntrik worshipper. “It appears,” says he, “from the genealogical books of the Varendra Brahmins of Bengal that Hindu Tāntrikism with the worship of the Tāntrika gods and goddesses spread to Orissa through the efforts of the Brahmins sent by Vallālasena, king of Gauḍa.”³

Vallāla ruled at least up to 1170 A. D. His Naihati grant is dated in the year 11. Now taking the initial year of the reign of Vallāla to be 1159-60 A. D., the date of the issue of the grant would be 1170-71 A. D.

This Naihati grant is the only one inscription that has been so far discovered of his time. Naihati is a village in the Katwa Sub-division of the Burdwan district. The grant is issued from the victorious camp of Vikramapura on the

¹ Quoted by N. N. Vasu in J. A. S. B., 1896.

² Notices of Sanskrit MSS. by Haraprasad Sastri, Second Series, p. 170. Archaeological Survey of Mayurbhanja, p. lxiv.

occasion of a solar eclipse and registers a *dakṣiṇā* for the golden-horse gift ceremony to the illustrious Ovāsudeva a student of the Kauthumī Śākhā of the *Sāmaveda*. It records the grant of a village in the Uttara-Rādhāmaṇḍala of the Vardhamānabhukti. The *dūtaka* of the grant was Harighoṣa the minister of peace and war. It is dated the 16th day of Vaiśākha, the year 11.¹

We now come to Lakshmaṇasena who succeeded his father Vallāla to the throne. We find a
 Lakshmaṇasena. good many titles and epithets coupled with his name. They are *aśvapati*, *gajapati*, *narapati*, *rājatrāyādhipati*, *paramēśvara*, *paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *paramasaura*, *mahārājādhirāja*, *arirāja* and *Madanaśaṅkara*. The exact date of his coronation ceremony has not yet been precisely determined. According to Babu Manomohan Chakravarti Lakshmaṇasena came to the throne in 1170 A. D.² But as we have already seen that the Naihati grant of Vallāla was issued in 1170 A. D. it is quite possible that he (Vallāla) ruled for some more years. As a matter of fact, the colophon of the *Saduktikarṇāmrita* enables us to determine the initial year of Lakshmaṇa's reign quite precisely. Śrīdharadāsa, the compiler of the anthology, gives the date of the compilation of his work thus:—“Śāke-saptaviṃśatyadhika-śata-upeta-daśa-śate-śaradāṃ Śrīmat-Lakshmaṇasena-Kṣhitipasya rasaikavimṣe Sayitur-gatyā Phālgunavimśeshu parārthahetave kutukāt Śrīdharadāsen-edam *Suktikarṇāmṛtaṃ* chakre.”³ Here the phrase *rasaikavimṣe* is clearly a copyist's mistake for *rājyaikavimṣe* as the former gives no meaning and makes the whole sentence obscure. But if we read *rājyaikavimṣe* for *rasaikavimṣe* the meaning of the whole sentence becomes at once clear. Then the statement would mean that in Śaka

The grant is published by Mr. R. D. Banerjee in Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, p. 176.

J. & Proc. A. S. B., Vol. I, 1904, Introduction to Pavanadūta.

Rajendralal Mitra's 'Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts,' Vol. III, p. 141.

1124, Phālgunā 20, which is the 21st year of the reign of Lakshmaṇasena Śrīdharadāsa compiled his work *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*. Now Śaka 1127, Phālgunā 20, if it be a northern year, would be equivalent to 11th February, 1206 A. D. Therefore, as 1206 A. D. is the 21st year of the reign of Lakshmaṇasena, he must naturally have come to the throne in 1185 A. D.

Lakshmaṇasena was the last great king of his family. His reign was marked both for the glorious career of his early life and for the serious reverses of his old age. We learn about his early career from his Madhainagar grant and from the Madanapaḍa grant of his son Viśvarūpasena. We know from the former grant that he led an expedition to Kalinga while quite a youth, subdued the king of Kāmarūpa and defeated the king of Kāśī. The latter grant records that he erected sacrificial posts in Purī, Benares and Prayāga to celebrate his victories. It seems from the above two statements that he led his expedition to Kalinga twice. His first Kalinga war was probably made in connection with the expedition of his grandfather Vijayasena which led to the defeat of Rāghava. Vijayasena ruled for an exceptionally long period and it is just possible that his grandson Lakshmaṇasena attained sufficient maturity at the time of his Kalinga war. The second Kalinga war of Lakshmaṇasena might have been fought against either Rājarāja II, son of Choragaṅga or Anaṅgabhīma II, the successor of Rājarāja II and another son of Choragaṅga. Rājarāja ruled from 1170 to 1190 A.D., while Anaṅgabhīma II ruled from 1190 to 1198 A.D. The king of Kāśī and Prayāga who was defeated by him must have been the Gaharwār king Jayachandra who was defeated by Shāhabuddin in 1194 A.D. The inscriptions of this king, found both at Benares and at Kanauj, range between 1170 and 1188 A.D. Vallabhadeva of Assam was most probably the king of Kāmarūpa defeated by Lakshmaṇasena

and spoken of in the Madhainagar grant. His inscription is dated Śaka 1107 or 1184-85 A.D.¹

This glorious and magnificent career of Lakshmaṇasena suffered a set-back in his old age. The celebrated *Taba-kāt-i-Nāsiri* of Minhaj tells us that between 1193 and 1205 A.D., he was totally defeated by Bakht-yār-Khālji and his capital Nudiāh was sacked. According to Mr. R. D. Banerjee² and S. Koomar the defeat of Lakshmaṇasena at the hand of Bākht-yār was a pure myth as Lakshmaṇasena had been dead long before the Nudiāh raid of Bākht-yār happened. Their argument is based on the controversy of the so-called Lakshmaṇasena era. As this era was, according to them, founded in 1119 A.D., in commemoration of the accession of Lakshmaṇasena to the throne and as the Bodh Gayā inscription of the time of Aśokchalla speaks of the date as the fifty-first year from the passing away of Lakshmaṇasena's reign, the king Lakshmaṇasena must have ceased to reign at least about 1170 A.D. (1119+51). So he could not have possibly been defeated, according to them, between 1193-1205 A.D. But as we shall see when we discuss the origin of the Lakshmaṇasena era, their view is not tenable. Lakshmaṇasena in fact came to the throne not in 1119 A.D., but in 1185 A.D., as we have already seen. According to Mr. S. Koomar, the whole account of Minhaj is so grossly exaggerated and so incredible that scarcely can any faith be placed in it. It is true that his statement that the mother of Lakshmaṇasena was tied up with legs turned upwards in order to prevent the birth of the child at an inauspicious moment, his mention that Lakshmaṇasena began to reign as soon as he was born, his narration of the capture of Nudiāh by Bākht-yār in the guise of a horse dealer and with the aid of eighteen of his horsemen only and many other similar statements are so opposed to nature and reason that it is not possible to believe them. But though

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. V, p. 184.

² Bāṅglār Itihāsa.

this part of Minhāj's account may be summarily rejected as exaggerated and based upon hearsays, we have not yet sufficient ground to disbelieve the main part of his story, namely, the defeat of Rao Lakshmanīā at the hand of Bākht-yar. The writing of history on the scientific basis has been introduced only in modern times and the ancient historians generally suffer more or less from exaggeration and confusion of mere anecdotes and hearsays with purely historical facts.

After the fall of Nudiāh Lakshmanāsena retired to his capital Vikramapura and died shortly after there. There is a considerable difference of opinion among scholars as to the exact location of Nudiāh. According to Manomohan Babu the Nudiāh of Minhāj and the Vijayapura of the *Pavanadūta* are the same and they are to be identified with the present Navadvīpa in the modern district of Nadia. But according to Ramaprasad Babu they are to be identified with Vijayanagara, a modern village in the district of Rajshahi. Taking Nudiāh to be identical with Vijayapura the question arises what was the exact location of Vijapura mentioned by Dhoyī, the author of the *Pavanadūta*. Ramaprasad Babu gives the following reasons for the identification of Vijayapura with Vijayanagara :

(1) The tradition points to a king Vijaya as the founder of Vijayanagara.

(2) The village of Deopara where the inscription of Vijayasena was found is situated only at a distance of 7 miles from this place and here can still be found the ruins of magnificent temples on the banks of the tank called Padum-sahar or the tank of Pradyumneśvara Śiva.

(3) It seems from the description of Minhāj that the city of Lakshmanawāti was not far from Nudiāh. Now tradition represents Gauḍa in the Maldah district as Lakshana-wāti. The spacious tank near the ruins of Gauḍa known as Sāgardighī is traditionally said to be the work of Lakshmanāsena. There is also an old ruined fortress here called the

fortress of Vallāla. Now the ruins of Vijayanagara are only at a distance forty-five miles from this Lakshanāwatī whereas Navadvīpa is at a distance of 110 miles from it.¹

But the description of the situation of Vijayapura as given in the Pavanadūta does not lend support to the view of Ramaprasad Babu. There we are told that the messenger Wind before proceeding to Vijayapūra the capital of Lakshmaṇa goes to Suhmadeśa. A detailed description of this Suhmadeśa is given. It was situated on the banks of the Ganges and there were in this place the images of Murāri, Ardhanariśvara-Śiva and Sūrya (Raghukulaguru), and king Vallāla, we are told, built here a high and lofty embankment (Śrī-Vallāla-setubandha). From this place the Wind is to go to a site where the Jumna comes out of the Ganges (V. 33) and thence he is at once to proceed to Vijayapura. Now generally the poet Dhoyī mentions the country first and then its capital as in the case of the kingdom of Kaliṅga he mentions the country first and then its town. It seems that here also the poet did exactly the same thing. He first gave detailed description of the country of Suhma and then mentioned the capital Vijayapura which was near a place where the Jumna comes out of the Ganges. Now as the district of Rajshahi is never known to have been included in the Suhmadeśa, Vijayanagara cannot be said to be the same as Vijayapura of Dhoyī. Vijayapura, we are expressly told, was situated at a place not very far from where the Jumna comes out of the Ganges. Where can this place be? Evidently it is Trivenī in the district of Hoogly. It is known as Muktaveni or the place where the Jumna becomes freed from the Ganges. "Three streams branch out at this point, Bhāgirathī flowing to the South, the Saraswatī to the west (right), and Jumna or *Kāncchrāpāra khāl* to the east (left)."² The ruins of the embankment made by Vallāla can still be traced here. The

¹ Gauḍa Rājamañit, pp. 74-5.

² Bengal Gazetteer, District Hoogly.

Jāmaijāngāl a high embankment with a magnificent broad flight of steps which is attributed to the Orias into whose hands Tribenī passed in the sixteenth century, must be the Śrī Vallāla-Setubandha mentioned in the *Pavanadūta*. The ruins of the temples of Murāri,¹ of Śiva (Chandrārdhivamauleh), and of Sūrya (Raghukulaguru), mentioned in the *Pavanadūta* can also be found either at Trivenī or at Saptagrāma, a place not very far from Trivenī. Thus Rakhaldas Babu writes:—

“The temple at Trivenī was most probably a Vaishṇava temple as the descriptive label shows,.....” “The inscription of the Sultan Shamsuddin Yusuf Sha of H. 888 has fallen from its place in the Masjid and is lying in the grave of Shah Safi. On examining it, it was found that this inscription was incised on the back of a lower part of an image of Sūrya.”² About the temple of Śiva in Trivenī the Bengal Gazetteer writes:—“There is a group of seven small temples 50 yards from the river of which the central one has a tower about 30 ft. high and 12 ft. square with *linga* inside.”³ As the central temple of this group is clearly a Śaiva one, it seems that all the others also contained the different forms of Śiva such as Ardhhanārīśvara, etc. The temple of Ardhhanārīśvara Śiva, it appears from the description given in the *Pavanadūta*, was not very far from the river and here also we find that this group of seven temples is situated only at a distance of 50 yards from the river. Thus the fact that in Trivenī in the Hoogly district the Jumna comes out of the Ganges, the existence of a high embankment named *jāmāijāngāl*, the traces of Viṣṇu, Śiva and Sūrya temples at or near about Trivenī all point to the conclusion that the old capital of Vijayapūra should be sought for in or near the

¹ *Pavanadūta*, V. 28.

² J. A. S. B., 1909, p. 247.

³ Bengal Gazetteer, District Hoogly.

modern district of Hoogly and not in Rajshahi as Ramaprasad Babu contends. There is one other strong objection against the view held by him. If Vijayapura of the *Pavanadūt* be identical with Vijayanagara in the Rajshahi district then the messenger Wind coming from the west must be made to cross the Ganges in order to reach the city. But this is not mentioned anywhere in the poem.

Lakshmaṇasena was a liberal patron of poets and literary men. Jayadeva, the celebrated author of the *Gitagobinda*, Dhoyī, the author of the *Pavanadūta*, and Halāyudha, the writer of *Brāhmaṇasarvasva*, a treatise on *Smṛti*, were among many others the ornaments of his court. Lakshmaṇa himself was a writer of no mean ability. He finished the *Adbhūta-sāgara* begun by his father Vallāla and composed many stray poems in praise of Viṣṇu, some of which are quoted in the anthology, *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*. He was also a benevolent and munificent king. Thus the *Taba-kāt-i-Nāsiri* records "trustworthy persons have related to this effect, that little or much never did any tyranny proceed from his hand; and whosoever preferred any request to him for anything, other than one lak he did not bestow after the manner of the beneficent Sultan Kutub-ud-din, the Hatim of his time."¹

Lakshmaṇa seems to have been a devoted worshipper of Nārāyaṇa, especially, his Narasiṃha incarnation. He gave up the religion of his forefathers and became a Vaishṇava. In the Tarpaṇadīghī and the Anulia grants he is styled as Parama Nārasiṃha. But though he was a Vaishṇava, he was tolerant towards other sects. Thus though his Madhainagar grant opens with an invocation to Nārāyaṇa it eulogises Panchānana. Similarly his Anulia grant though it contains the phrase *Om Namo Nārāyanāya*, invokes Sambhū.

¹ Taba-kāt-i-Nāsiri, pp. 555-6 (Raverty's Translation).

Of the grants of Lakshmanasena the existence of five so far has been made known to us. These Grants of Lakshmanasena. are his Tarpanadighi grant, Anulia grant, Sundarbana grant and one unpublished grant. Of these grants only the first three have been edited and published. The Sundarbana grant was noticed by Pandit Ramagati Nyayaratna in an essay called *Bāṅglābhāṣā o Shāhityavishyaka-prastāva*. Since then the grant has been lost sight of. The last grant has not yet been published. We hear it is in the possession of Babu Amulyacharana Vidya-bhushana who thinks of editing it. We will now give a short account of the first three grants.

1. The Tarpanadighi grant:—

Tarpanadighi is a village in the Dinajpur district. The grant was issued on the occasion of the *hemāśvaratha* gift ceremony to Iśvaradevaśarman, a student of the Kauthumi branch of the *Sāmaveda*. The *dūtaka* of the grant was Nārāyaṇa Datta, the minister of peace and war. The grant was issued from the victorious camp of Vikramapura.¹

2. Anulia grant:—

Anulia is a village near Rānāghaṭ in the district of Nadia. The grant was issued from the victorious camp of Vikramapura to Raghudevaśarman, a student of the Kāṇva śākhā of the *Yajurveda*. The *dūtaka* of the grant was the same Nārāyaṇa Datta, minister of peace and war, who had been mentioned in the same capacity in the Tarpanadighi grant.²

3. Madhainagar grant:—

Madhainagar is a village in the subdivision of Sirājganj in the district of Pabna. The inscription records the grant

¹ The grant was published by Mr. R. D. Banerji in Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 6.

² The grant was published by Babu Akshaya Kumar Maitra, C. I. E., in J. A. S. B., 1900.

of the village Dāpaniyāpātaka in Puṇḍravardhanabhukti to a Brāhmaṇa named Govindaśarman.¹

The epigraphic evidence discloses the fact that Lakshma-sena was succeeded by his son Viśvarūpa who in his turn again was succeeded by Keśava.

Successors of
Lakshmaṇasena.

The Madanpada grant of Viśvarūpa and the Idilpur charter of Keśava are exactly similar in nature but with this distinction that the grant of the latter contains some more additional verses which are wanting in that of the former. It appears also that the name Viśvarūpa has been erased from the Idilpur grant and that of Keśava has been put instead. This seems to prove that Viśvarūpa was the elder brother and succeeded Lakshmaṇa. We know nothing about the political activities of these two kings beyond the fact that they called themselves Gauḍeśvara and took the proud title of *Garga-Yavanānvaya-pralaya-kāla-Rudra*. The invasion of Bakht-i-yar-khālī was most probably in the nature of a temporary inroad and his rule in Bengal did not extend beyond a few miles of Lakhanāwatī. The fact that the grants of these two rulers were made in the Puṇḍravardhanabhukti and also the fact that they like their father assumed such high-sounding titles as *aśvapati*, *gajapati*, *narapati*, *rājatrayaādhipati*, *parameśvara*, *paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *paramasaura arirāja* and *Viśhavāṅkaśaṃkara* and *Asahyaśaṃkara* respectively, show that they were rulers of no mean ability.

Abul Fazal mentions one Mādhavasena, son of Lakshmaṇasena who ruled for a period of 10 years after his father. In the anthology of Śrīdharadāsa some verses are quoted of one Mādhavasena. But whether this Mādhava ruled in Bengal and also whether he preceded or succeeded Viśvarūpa and Keśava we have no means of ascertaining. At least no inscription of this king has been found in Bengal. Babu Nagendra Nath Vasu

Mādhava Sena.

¹ The grant was published by Mr. R. D. Banerji in J. A. S. B., 1909, p. 471,

says that one copper-plate grant of Mādhavasena has been found in a temple in the city of Almora in the Kumayun district, U. P. According to the same authority another copper-plate dated 1223 A. D., has been found in Belesvara temple in the Kedāra tracts of the Himalayas in which the word *Vaṅgaja Brāhmaṇas* appears. From this Nagen Babu is inclined to believe that after the invasion of Bengal by Bākht-i-yar, Mādhavasena left Bengal and went on a pilgrimage to Kedāranāth. This Mādhavasena has been identified by the same learned writer with Danaujamādhava of the *Kula-pañjikās*, and has been placed before Viśvarūpa and Keśava. But there is no trustworthy evidence which makes Danaujamādhava a son or successor of Lakshmaṇa.

With Keśava the Sena dynasty seems to have come to an end. The only trace of the Sena ruler that we meet with after him is that of Darauja Mādhava in the thirteenth century when Ghiyāsuddin Balban came to Bengal, chastised the rebel Mugisud-din, and forced the Sena chief to give an undertaking not to help him.

The Madanapada grant is the only one inscription so far found of the reign of Viśvarūpasena.

Grant of Viśvarūpa. Madanapada is a village in the Faridpur district. The inscription records the grant of certain lands situated in the village of Piñjakāsthī in the Puṇḍravardhanabhukti. It was issued from the victorious camp pitched at the village of Phalgu to the śrūtipāthaka, Viśvarūpadevaśarman. The *dūtaka* of the grant was the illustrious Kapivishṇu, the minister of peace and war.

Of the reign of Keśavasena only his Idilpur grant is so far known to exist. Idilpur is a village in

Grant of Keśava. the parganā of the same name in the district of Backerganj. The grant was issued from the victorious camp of Jambugrāma on the occasion of the king's birth-day. The recipient of the grant was a Brāhmaṇa named Isvaradevaśarman.

CHAPTER II.

Administrative History.

So far in regard to the political history of Bengal during the Sena period. We shall now attempt to set forth the administration of this province such as was prevalent in this period. Much light is thrown on this matter by the grants of these kings which all without exception reveal a long list of officials seldom varying. If we are but able to understand what function exactly they discharged, that cannot fail to give us a fairly good idea of the administrative system which characterised the Sena rule over Bengal. This list is as follows:—

(1) Rājā, (2) Rājanyaka, (3) Rājñī, (4) Rāṇaka, (5) Rājaputra, (6) Rājāmātya, (7) Mahāpurohita, (8) Mahādharmādhyaksha, (9) Mahāsāndhivigrihaka, (10) Mahāsenāpati, (11) Mahāmudrādhikṛta, (12) Antaraṅga, (13) Vṛhaduparika, (14) Mahākshapaṭalika, (15) Mahāpratihāra, (16) Mahāvyūhapati, (17) Mahābhogika, (18) Mahāpilupati, (19) Mahāgaṇastha, (20) Daussadhika, (21) Chauroddharaṇika, (22-26) Nau-vala-hasti-aśva-go-mahish-aj-avik-ādi vyāpṛtaka, (27) Gaulmika, (28) Daṇḍa-pāśika, (29) Daṇḍanāyaka, (30) Vishayapati.

Now let us proceed to identify these officials as far as possible and see what was the nature of their duty. At the very outset we find from the above list that the names of the officials are arranged in three well-marked grades. The first of these describes the status of feudatory princes and queens. The second grade consists of officials who are distinguished from the third by the prefix *mahā* or *vṛihad* attached to their names, while the third grade is composed of subordinate officials.

Among the officials of the first grade the *Rāja* is awarded the highest place of honour. He had always been an important personage in the ancient Hindu polity. We find him mentioned as a state-official as early as the Vedic period. The *Maitrāyaṇi Samhitā* enumerates *rājan* as one of the *ratnins* of the sovereign.¹ But whatever his position might be in that remote period, under the Sena rule he was not an official directly connected with the state business, but the highest feudal lord of the realm. The only kind of service he rendered to his overlord must evidently have been of the military nature.

The *Rājanyakas* who come next in order, were also a class of feudatories. Dr. Vogel has pointed out the important fact that they used to date their inscriptions both in the *Sāstra* era and in the regnal year of the *rājā* to whom they owed allegiance.² The very fact that in their records they refer also to the regnal year of another king shows that the latter was the overlord and they, his feudatories.

The *Rājñīs* may be either the queen-consorts or the quasi-independent feudal sovereigns like the famous *Rāṇī Bhowānī* of recent times. The *rājñīs* as queen consorts (*mahishīs*) seem to hold a highly important place from very ancient times in India. The *mahishī* as one of the eight *vīras* is mentioned in the *Pañchaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa* along with *Purohita*, *Sūta*, *gramanī*, *Kshattrī*, and *samgrahitṛi* who are all officials.³ And we also find that queens were included by Kautilya in the list of State-servants and their salaries specified. Kautilya, however, distinguishes between two kinds of such queens, namely, those who were *rājamātā*, mother of king and the other *rājamahishi*, the chief queen. They are, however, placed by him last in the highest class of state officials. But in the Sena period it is doubtful whether queens of the ruling

¹ Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, by Mr. Narendra Nath Law, p. 87.

² J. R. A. S., 1908, p. 537.

³ Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, p. 87.

family were looked upon as state-servants. As *rājñi* of the Sena inscriptions occurs among personages who were evidently feudatories and not mere state officials it is reasonable to suppose that *rājñi* denoted some semi-independent chieftain of this type and such as was represented in modern times by the famous Rāñi Bhowānī of Natore.

The *Rāṇās* who are the same as the *rāṇakas* have been taken by Dr. Vogel¹ and others to be identical with the *rajanayakas*. But as they were separately mentioned in the lists of the Pāla, Sena and the Varman inscriptions, they were, evidently two different classes of feudatories at least in Bengal from the Pāla period onwards. The *rājaputras* who are named last in the first grade were most probably not the princes of the blood royal but the ordinary Rajput soldiers holding fiefs from the kings in return for their military service. If they were the princes of the royal family it is not understood why they should be named last. The term *rājaputra* in the sense of Rajputs actually occurs in the Naihati grant of Vallālasena (v. 3) and we may reasonably hold that here in the list also the *rājaputras* were mere feudatories.

Among the officials of the second grade occur the following :—(1) The *Rājāmātyas*.—They were the ministers of the king. Kautilya always speaks of the *amātyas* in the sense of ministers.² It may be said that the *rājāmātyas* of the Sena grants may not be the same as the *amātyas* of Kautilya. But that they were so is evident from the fact that both here and in Kautilya they are mentioned before the priest. The very fact that the order of naming the *amātyas* and the *Purohita* is the same in both the places, leaves very little room for doubt that they were the identical officials.

¹ J. R. A. S., 1908, p. 536.

² Arthśāstra (English Translation, First Edition), Book I, Chaps. IX and X, pp. 16-18.

(2) *Mahāpurohita* or *Purohita*.—The office of the *purohita* which is called *purohiti* or *purodhā* in the *R̥gveda*, is a very ancient one. In the time of the *R̥gveda* the *purohita* besides taking the part as *Hotr* used to advise the king in all matters concerning religion.¹ In the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* he is called *Rāstragopa* (the protector of the *rāshṭra* or realm) and insured the king's power over his subjects and his safety and victory in battle.² In the epic period his office was principally of a religious nature though he was very often entrusted with the education of the royal princes.³ His position, however, appears to have been very high in the time of the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya. He is spoken of next to the ministers (*amātyas*) by Kauṭilya and it is laid down by him that "As a student his teacher, a son his father, a servant his master, the king shall follow him."⁴ We are, however, not in a position to ascertain the exact nature of the duty of the *purohita* under the Sena kings. But as we have remarked before that the order of naming the *amātyas* and the *purohita* is the same in both Kauṭilya and the grants of the Sena kings, we may hold that their duty must also have been analogous. An idea of the duties they were required to perform may be had from the rule laid down by Kauṭilya for their selection. According to him, "Him whose family and character are highly spoken of, who is well educated, in the Vedas and in the six Aṅgas, is skilful in reading portents, providential or accidental, is well versed in the science of government and is obedient and who can prevent calamities, providential or human, by performing such expiatory rites as are prescribed in the *Atharvaveda*, the king shall employ as high priests."⁵ It is interesting to note

¹ Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, pp. 38-50.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Artha. (Eng. Tran.), p. 17.

⁵ *Ibid.*

in this connection that the Purohita does not figure at all in the grants of the Pāla kings. Is it because they were all Buddhists?

(3) *Mahādharmaḍyaksha*.—*Dharmaḍhyaksha* in the sense of a judge occurs in the *Mahābhārata* in the list of eighteen *tīrthas* or state officials.¹ In the *Arthāśāstra* of Kauṭilya he is called *dharmastha* and three *dharmasthas* together with three *amātyas* are required to administer justice.

(4) *Mahāsāndhivigrahika*.—He, as the name signifies, was the minister of peace (*sandhi*) and war (*vigraha*). It is a remarkable fact that this important officer of the later times does not occur either in Kauṭilya or in any of the pre-Kauṭilyan works. The mention of this officer is first met with in the Gupta inscriptions. One of the functions of this official was to act, not infrequently, as a *dūtaka* or the gift-causer of the grants issued by the king.

(5) *Mahāsenāpati*.—He is evidently the commander-in-chief of the army. He is mentioned in the list of eighteen *tīrthas* of the *Mahābhārata* under the name of *Chamupati* by the commentator Nilakantha.² The *Senāpati* also occurs in Kauṭilya.³ According to Dr. Fleet "the *mahāsenāpati* seems to have denoted equal rank with *mahārāja* and *mahāsāmanta*."⁴ But whether he enjoyed such immense power and prestige is a matter of grave doubt. If the *rājā* and the *mahārājā* be two different persons, then it is evident from the prefix *mahā* attached to the name of the latter that he was superior to the former. Now we have seen that *rājā* was the highest feudal lord of the realm and as such he is named first in the first grade. Therefore it is very difficult to believe that the *mahāsenāpati* who occupies the fifth place in the second grade should either be superior to the *rājā*

¹ Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, pp. 84-5.

² *Ibid.*

³ Artha. (Eng. Tran.), p. 23.

⁴ Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, p. 15 n.

(in case the *rājā* and the *mahārājā* happen to be two different persons) or equal to him (in case the *rājā* and the *mahārājā* are the same person). In fact the *rājā* or the *mahārājā* was a semi-independent feudal chief and as such he derived his power and importance from the magnitude of his fiefs which he held from the king. But the *mahāsenāpati* was a mere paid officer of the state, and he had no importance apart from his office.

(6) *Mahāmudrādhikṛta*.—According to Mr. Radha-govinda Basak, he is the keeper of the Royal seal. But as Kautilya's *mudrādhyakṣha* is the superintendent of the passports, it would be prudent to take *mudrādhikṛta* also in the same sense. But if it be contended that the person entrusted with the royal seal also used to superintend the passports, then that would be all right. In fact, in the absence of sufficient materials it is very difficult to hold a view in one way or the other.

(7-8) *Antaraṅga-vṛhaduparika*.—In the body of the article, "Belava copper plate of Bhojavarmadeva," Mr. Basak takes *antaraṅgavṛhaduparika* as one compound and translates the phrase by 'chief-privy councillor.' But for doing so he does not offer any explanation. He refers in the footnote only to a short note by Babu Akshaya Kumar Maitra, C.I.E., who has found out from Śivadāsa's commentary on the *Chakradatta* (Calcutta edition) that in the inscriptions the *antaraṅga* is used "in a technical sense to signify the royal physician." It would be better therefore to separate *antaraṅga* and *vṛhaduparika* and take the former in the sense of a royal physician and see what the latter signifies. The exact function of this official, *Vṛhaduparika*, is not yet precisely known. Dr. Fleet in his index to the Gupta inscriptions says that the term requires explanation. There is however, a form, *uparikāra*. Dr. Bühler in his article on "Additional Valabhi grants" (*Indian Antiquary*, 1878, p. 66), gives the following short note on *uparikāra*: "*Upari* usually

spelt *upri*, is a Mārāṭhā revenue term which denotes 'a temporary holder who cultivates land in a village, where he does not reside.' It seems to me very probable that the *upari* of the plates is the same word. Compare the Gujrati *uparivōda* and the Hindi *uparivar*." It seems from the above note of Bühler, that the *uparikāra* was a fiscal term connected with some kind of land revenue. It may not be improbable that the *uparikāra* and the *uparika* are derived from the same root *upari*. If that be so, then *vṛhaduparika* must be some higher official who used to superintend the subordinate *uparikas* who were fiscal officers.

Mahākshapaṭalika.—Dr. Fleet has taken him to be the "Superior officer of the *akshapaṭalikas* or keeper of records." But it seems from the elaborate description of his duties in Kautilya that he was not merely the superintendent of the keepers of records but an accountant-general of the state. These are some of his functions specified in the *Arthosāstra*. He was to keep the account of the amount of profit, loss, expenditure, delayed earnings, the amount of *vyaji* (premia in kind of cash) realized, the status of government agency employed, the amount of wages paid, the number of free labourers engaged (*vishṭi*), pertaining to the investment of capital or any work; likewise in case of gems and commodities of superior or inferior value, rate of their price, the rate of their barter," etc., etc.

Mahāpratihāra.—The office of the principal gate-keeper or the chamberlain was always an important one in the states of ancient India. This official is mentioned under the name of *dvārapāla* in the list of eighteen *tīrthas* of the *Mahābhārata* by Nilakantha. Kautilya in a passage where he says that spies should be appointed to watch over state officials, names *dauvārika* (which is the same as *dvārapāla* of the *Mahābhārata* and the *pratihāra* of the Sena grants) along with *mantrin*, *purohita*, *senāpati*, *yuvarāja* and others. The importance of his position is seen from the fact that

both in the lists of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Kauṭīliya* he is named in the fifth place and mentioned in the former list directly after the *chamūpati* and in the latter list after the *yuvarāja*.

Mahāvīryūhapati.—He is evidently a high military officer of the state. The *vyūha* is a particular arrangement of soldiers at the time of battle. The *Mahābhārata* mentions different kinds of *vyūhas* “often named after birds, the word wing used as well in the *Mahābhārata* as in modern warfares suggesting the idea.” The *Chakravīryūha* was one of many such *vyūhas*, which was adopted by Droṇa at the time of killing Abhimanyu.¹ He appears to be the actual tactician on the battle-field and must have been an assistant of the *senāpati*.

Mahābhogika.—A considerable difficulty is felt in identifying this official here. According to Dr. Fleet, “In the inscriptions it is a technical official title, connected with the territorial terms *bhoga* and *bhukti*.”² *Mahābhogika* may have been an official of a *bhoga* or a *bhukti* in other inscriptions, but here as he comes between such military officials as *mahāvīryūhapati* on the one hand and *mahāpilupati* and *mahāgaṇastha* on the other, it seems that he too was a military officer here. The Sanskrit-English dictionary of Monier Williams explains the term by “housekeeper” or a “groom” and Mr. Rādhagovinda Basak has taken *mahābhogika* to be the chief groom.

Mahāpilupati.—*Pilu* is probably a Persian term. *Mahāpilupati* was most probably the chief commander of the elephant-forces. It may be somewhat a matter of surprise to find that the Hindu independent kings such as the Varmans and the Senas living far away from the centre of Mahomedan influence should name their military officials by a Persian term. But this is by no means a unique

¹ Epic India, C. V. Vaidya, p. 260.

² Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, p. 100, n. 2.

instance. We have the use of *dibira* another Persian term in the post-Gupta inscriptions, in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataranginī* and also in the *Daśakumāra-charita*. After the Guptas the Hūṇas, Gurjaras, and other foreign tribes poured into India one after another bringing with them some culture of the Persian or Sassanian kingdom. This explains why such terms as *divira* and *pilu* make their appearance for the first time during the occupation of India by these foreign hordes.

Mahāgaṇastha.—He is the last of the officials of the second grade. Gaṇa is a squadron of soldiers and the *mahāgaṇastha* is evidently the chief commander of a *gaṇa* squadron. A *gaṇa* is composed of 27 elephants, 27 chariots 81 horses and 135 foot-soldiers.¹

Vishayapati.—He was the officer of a *vishaya* or a district. The entire empire of the Pālas and the Senas like that of the Guptas was divided into several *bhuktis* and these were again subdivided into *vishayas*. The *vishayas* were further subdivided into *bhogas* and *maṇḍalas*. The *grāmas* were the units of *bhogas* and *maṇḍalas*. Thus we noticed several *bhuktis*, e.g., *Punḍravardhana* and *Vardhamāna* in the Sena grants. We also know that there were the Vikramapura *bhoga*, and Koṭivarsha *vishaya* and *Varendramandala* in the *Punḍravardhanabhukti*, and North Rāḍhā *maṇḍala* in the *Vardhamānabhukti*.

Daṇḍapāsika.—According to Pandit Bhagwan Lal Indraji he was the head police officer. Dr. Fleet also takes him to be a police officer. Literally the word means holding the fetters or noose of punishment.

Daṇḍanāyaka.—According to Dr. Fleet, he was a military officer, the word literally meaning the leader of forces. But *daṇḍa* may mean either 'a force' or 'punishment.' It is better here to take the term in the sense of an inflictor

¹ Belava Copper Plate, Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, footnote.

of punishment, *i.e.*, a magistrate. The list of the military officials has already been given before. Here as the officer comes after another executive officer, namely, that of the police, it is reasonable to take *daṇḍanāyaka* to be a magistrate. It is a noteworthy fact that *daṇḍapāla* in the sense of a guardian of punishment occurs both in the *Mahābhārata* and in the *Kauṭilya*.

The third grade is composed of :—

(1) *Daussādhika*.—He was the superintendent of villages. The office of this man must have been a very ancient one, though we do not find any mention of him in *Kauṭilya*. We know from the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* and *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* that the *grāmaṇi* was entrusted with that office in that remote period. The duty of the *grāmaṇi* has thus been described by the author of the “Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity.” “His importance as a state official is realised only when we bear in mind that in early times he had military duties to perform for which he might be called as a troop leader. It is probable that he is the head of all village headmen in the realm.”¹ Whether he was a military officer in our period or whether his office was analogous to something like that of a ‘*patil*’ of the later times we have no definite knowledge, but as he comes first in the third grade, it seems that he was an important official. It may not be unlikely that he was also the “Headman of all village headmen in the realm,” as in the Vedic times, and was charged with the general safety and management of the villages.

(2) *Chauroddharanika*.—According to Pandit Bhagawan Lal Indraji he was a thief-catcher.² In India there have been from very ancient times two ways of catching thieves. One of these methods is to set a thief to catch a thief, and the other is the tracking system. According to Pandit Bhagawan

¹ Pp. 84-90.

² Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part 1, pp. 81-82.

Lal Indraji the second practice was probably in vogue in Gujrat where in the Valabhi grants the term *Chauroddhara-nika* occurs but what method was adopted in the Pāla and Sena empire we have no means of knowing.

(3-8) *Nau-bala-hasty-aśva-go-mahish-aj-āvik-ādi-vyāpṛtaka*.—Babu Radhagovindā Basak has translated the phrase by “Inspectors of fleet, elephants, horses, cows, buffaloes, goats, sheep, etc.” It is not understood what he exactly means by inspectors of the fleet, etc. The terms *nāvādhyaksha*, *hastyadhyaksha*, *aśvādhyaksha*, and *go-adhyaksha* appear in Kauṭilya. It seems to us proper to take *nau-vyapṛtaka*, *hasti-vyapṛtaka* and others to be the same as *nāvādhyaksha*, *hastyadhyaksha* and others of Kauṭilya. These officers of Kauṭilya are connected with revenue office. The *nāvādhyaksha* was the superintendent of ships and his office was to examine “the accounts relating to navigation not only on oceans and mouths of rivers but also on lakes natural or artificial and rivers in the vicinity of a *sthāniya*,¹ and other fortified cities.”²

(9) *Hasti-vyapṛtaka*.—The office of *hastyadhyaksha* as we know from Kauṭilya was an important one. *Hastyadhaksha* was charged with the safety and general management of elephants whether domesticated or wild. The capture of elephants by private persons, it seems, was strictly prohibited and this officer was to prosecute all persons who dared to infringe the law.

(10) *Aśva-vyapṛtaka*.—He was the same as *aśvyādhyaksha* of Kauṭilya. He was the superintendent of horses. His business was ‘to register the breed, age, marks, groups or classes of horses, to classify these that are kept in sale-house for sale, those that are recently purchased and those that have been captured in war,’³ etc.

¹ A fortress in the vicinity of 800 villages.

² *Arthaśāstra*, p. 156.

³ *Ibid*, p. 164.

(11-14) *Go-mahish-aj-āvik-ādi-vyapṛtaka*.—Here one person was appointed to look after the management of all these animals. This was the case in the time of Kauṭilya also. The duty of this officer of Kauṭilya was to supervise (i) herds maintained for wages, (ii) herds surrendered for a fixed amount of dairy produce, (iii) useless and abandoned herds, (iv) herds maintained for a share in a dairy produce, (v) classes of herds, (vi) cattle that strayed and (vii) cattle that are irrevocably lost and (viii) amassed quantity of milk and butter. He also used to collect the various sorts of income accruing from the management of cattle.¹

(15) *Gaulmika*.—Babu Radhagovinda Basak has taken this officer to be the commander of a *gulma*, squadron, but as he is mentioned along with so many other revenue officers it is best to take him as a revenue officer also. According to Dr. Fleet he is the superintendent of woods and forests.² This gives a better sense here. The office of the superintendent of forests is a very ancient one. This officer is mentioned in the list of eighteen *tīrthas* by the commentator of the *Mahābhārata* under the name of *aṭavipāla*³ and in the *Kauṭilya* under the name of *Kupyādhyaśha*.⁴

¹ *Ibid*, p. 159.

² *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, p. 42, n. 4.

³ *Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*.

⁴ *Artha.*, pp. 99-101.

CHAPTER III.

Fiscal History.

We have hitherto considered the political and the administrative history of the Sena period. Now we shall try to give an account of the fiscal condition of the times. In an agricultural country like India land has always been the most important source of wealth to the country and revenue to the royal exchequer. So if we can but find out the general condition of the land system under the Sena rule we shall get a fair glimpse into the fiscal condition of the country. The epigraphic records of the Sena kings give the description of the following fiscal details including those of land :—

(1) *Grāma*.—It was the village proper. We shall obtain a clearer idea of the position the village occupied in the fiscal system during the Sena period after we have considered the various details referred to in the Sena grants. These we shall now discuss one by one.

(2) *Pātaka*.—According to the lexicographer Hemachandra, *pātaka* is one half of a village. In the inscriptions *pātaka* is never used independently but always as a suffix to some proper name of a village; as for example we have *Chadaspāsāpātaka* in the Madhainagar grant of Lakshmana Sena. Here Chadaspāsāpātaka denotes half of the village of Chadaspāsā.

(3) *Vāstu*.—It was the site either of a village or of a house.¹

(4) *Kshetra*, *Khila*, *nāla* and *ushara*.—We have now to note four fiscal terms together, as they cannot be properly understood unless they are compared with one another and unless their exact difference is taken into proper consideration.

¹ *Vaijanti of Yādavaprakāśa*, edited by Gustav Oppert, p. 159, l. 19 and p. 236, l. 159.

One of these, namely, *Khila*, has been defined by Hemachandra in the *Abhidhāna-chintāmaṇi* as follows: *Kshetrādy-aprahataṃ sthānaṃ Khilam*.¹ Two conclusions may be deduced from this. The first is that *Kshetra* has the generic sense of cultivable land and the second that *Khila* is an uncultivated *Kshetra*.

The question that now arises is what could be the term for a *Kshetra* land which is under actual cultivation. This of course is the term *nāla* which has been defined by Yādavaprakāśa in the *Vaijayanti* as *prahataṃ sthānaṃ*—furrowed land.² We thus get the cultivable land (*Kshetra*) which when under cultivation is called *nāla* but which, if left fallow, becomes *khila*. But what about the land which is unworthy of being brought under cultivation? How was it designated? The Sena inscriptions speak of only one such kind of land, namely *Ushara*, which according to the *Vaijayanti* is *Ushanati* (bhumī),³ i.e., land containing *Usha*⁴ or saline earth.

(5) *Go-patha*.—It was, as the name signifies, the cattle track. It is used in the inscriptions generally in connection with the fixing of the village boundaries and it thus seems that the word denoted the cattle track running from one village to another.

(6) *Go-chara*.—It is evidently the grazing ground for cattle. The practice of keeping aside the pasture land for cattle is a very ancient one. Thus it is stated by Kautilya that the king should make provision for pasture grounds on uncultivated land. According to Manu the pasture land should lay around the village and should be 100 dhanush⁵ in width.

¹ *Abhidhānachintāmaṇi*, 242.

² *Vaijayanti*, p. 124, l. 35.

³ P. 124, l. 36.

⁴ *Uspostu Kshātravarttika*, *Vaijayanti*, p. 125, l. 49.

⁵ Chap. VIII, V. 237.

(7) *Trṇayuti*.—Messrs. R. D. Banerjee¹ and R. G. Basak² have translated *trṇayuti* by grass land. But as in the inscriptions *trṇayuti* and *go-chara* are used side by side and as the latter term also means the grassy plot of land, if we translate *trṇayuti* by grass land we fail to distinguish between the two. According to Babu Kishori Mohan Gupta, M.A., *trṇayuti* is distinct from *go-chara* inasmuch as the former forms the part of the boundaries of the village.³ *Trṇayuti*, he points out, is often used with *simā* boundary, as for example, *Sava-simā trṇayuti-go-chara paryanta* is used in the Rajore inscription of Mathanadeva⁴ and also in the Monghyr Copper plate inscription of Devapāla.⁵ But his explanation of the term *trṇayuti* does not seem to be very happy. The boundary which is indicated by a grassy plot of land is sure to be an unstable one and so it is unsafe to mark out a boundary with a grassy plot of land. Kishori Babu has also given another sense of the term. In the second sense it denotes the cultivable fields lying fallow after the harvest and serving as pasture land temporarily. But neither in the old *koshas* nor in the inscriptions have we met with this use of the term. The real meaning of the term *trṇayuti* (as *yuti* lit. means pile or stack), seems to be that it was a plot of land in which the villagers used to stack dry grass, as a provision for emergency such as draught, famine, etc. As the term is used in connection with *simā*, it seems *trṇayuti* was situated on the outskirts of the village. It was so situated probably for the safety of the village from fire. It is very dangerous to keep a large pile of dry grass in the midst of the village for if once the fire breaks out the whole village is liable to be burnt down. The villagers of Rajputana and Central Provinces,

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, p. 152.

² Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, 19, 3-14.

³ Land System in accordance with Epigraphic Evidence, Ind Ant., April, 1922, p. 74.

⁴ Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 266.

⁵ Gauda Lekhamālā, p. 39.

we hear, even to this day stack dry grass on a plot of land for the common use of the village.

(8) *Tala and Uddesā*.—Rakhal Das Babu¹ and Radha-govindā Babu² have taken *sa-tala* and *sa-uddesabhumī* to mean land with bottom and surface, i.e., the land with the underground right (i.e., the right of mining) and the surface right. We have, however, no proof whatsoever for holding that in our period the right of mining was conceded to the individual subject of the sovereign. On the other hand we know from Kauṭīliya that the mining operations were used to be carried in his time by the king. And as the kings were always jealous of their rights and privileges and had always power to enforce, it is not reasonable to say that they conceded them to private individuals unless there is a strong evidence to that effect.

Tala as Kishori Babu³ rightly points out is low land. This seems to be borne out by the *Vaijayanti*.⁴ In Bengal, specially in East Bengal, certain parts of the village being low land would remain under water during the rainy seasons and this is probably denoted by *tala*. *Uddesa* in contrast to *tala* would be high land. Though Kishori Babu has taken *uddesa* to mean high land, he has made a slight mistake, we think, in taking high land to imply “embankments,” “earthen mounds.” To us, *Uddesa* seems to be those lands which would not be merged under water even during the rainy seasons. The distinction between two kinds of land is observed even to this day in East Bengal and the value of land differs accordingly. The value of the low land is somewhat higher than that of the high land on which generally the *āman* and *ropā* paddies (i.e., the paddies which becomes ready in the months of December and January) cannot grow well. In the present-day Bengal, the low and

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, p. 259.

² Ep. Ind., Vol. XII.

³ Ind. Ant., 1922, p. 74.

⁴ *Vaijayanti*, edited by Gustav Oppert, p. 232, l. 70 and also p. 521.

high lands are known respectively as *nichu* and *bhiṭā* or *dāngā jami*.

Jala and Sthala.—*Jala* included tanks, wells, lakes, etc., while *Sthala* probably indicated land with various gardens.

Garṭa.—It was the pit, the trench. Probably it was equivalent to modern Bengali *dovā* which is generally used for depositing the refuse of the houses.

Jhāṭabīṭapāḥ, guvāka-nārikela, āmra-panasa-bhūmi.—The term *jhāṭabīṭapāḥ* is equivalent of *jhārabīṭapāḥ* which means bushes and trees. *Sa-jhāṭabīṭapāḥ bhūmi*, therefore, means land with trees and bushes. The *guvāka-nārikela* and the *āmra-panasa-bhūmi* undoubtedly contained betel-nut, coconut, mango and jackfruit trees. The gardens of these fruit trees have always been of great value and as such a regular source of income to those who possessed them.

Having obtained an idea of the different aspects of land in a village we shall now proceed to see the method of their measurement. Fortunately for us, unlike the Pāla records, almost all the grants of the Sena kings give a detailed account of the land measurement system. The land was used to be measured by two kinds of rods (*nala*). One of them was the old rod that was current in the country of Samatāṭa (*Samatāṭiya nala*).¹ The other, the *Ṛṣasavaśaṅkaranala*,² seems to have been introduced by Vijayasena himself. We know that his *biruda* or surname was *Ṛṣhabhaśaṅkara* and it is in every way probable that he introduced the new rod of measurement which was called after him.

The following were the various standards for measuring lands by these rods :—*pāṭaka*, *droṇa*, *āḍhaka*, *khāṇī*, *unmāna* and *kāka*.

Pāṭaka.—It was, as we have already seen, the half of a village. The measure of a *pāṭaka* varied according to the variation in the area of a village.

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, p. 276.

² Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, p. 156.

According to the *Mānasāra Śilpashāstra* which enumerates forty different kinds of villages and towns, the smallest village would be of 500 *gaṇḍas* or 400 ft. square in area.

**Droṇa*, *āḍhaka* and *kāka*.—These as standards for measuring space are not met with either in the old lexicons or in any Sanskrit works, such as the *Mahābhārata*, the *Dharmasūtras* and the *Arthashastra*. All these occur in them as standards for measuring quantity only. The reason for this is that they were the standards of land measurement peculiar to East Bengal and therefore unknown elsewhere. Even to this day these standards survive in some parts of East Bengal, such as the district of Mymensingh, Faridpur, Barisal and others.

It is interesting to note here that until very recently the rod (*nala*) was used in these districts as in the days of the Sena kings.

The standards for measuring land such as are in vogue in the parganās Mymensingh and Hussensāhi in the district of Mymensingh, are given below :—

4 Kākas	make 1 gaṇḍā
20 gaṇḍās	„ 1 kāthā
20 kāthās	„ 1 kānī
4 kānīs	„ 1 āḍhā (<i>i.e.</i> , āḍhaka of the inscriptions)
16 āḍhās	„ 1 droṇa (same as droṇa of the grants)
1 āḍhā	„ 100 × 100 yds. sq.
1 yard	„ 26 inches.

Unnāra and *khāḍī*, so far as we know, are not in vogue in Bengal at present and as such they cannot be identified with any definiteness.

CHAPTER IV.

SOCIAL HISTORY.

Now we come to the Social History of the period. Here too our authentic sources of information must be the inscriptions. The first question that arises is whether anything that pertains to the modern social structure is traceable therein. The highest castes of Bengal are the Brāhmaṇas, the Vaidyas and the Kāyasthas. Do we find anything in these records which relates to these castes? It is worthy of note that while the names of the different officials are mentioned in the grants their surnames or family names are also sometimes specified. Thus we find the name Sāladda Nāga in the Barrackpur grant of Vijayasena Hari Ghosha in the Naihati grant of Vallāla and Nārāyaṇa Datta in the Tarpana-dīghī and Anulia charters of Lakshmaṇa. All these were *dūtakas* in regard to their respective grants, and the last two of them have been expressly designated as *Sāndhivigrahakas*. Now *Ghosha* is a typically Kāyastha surname, and *Nāga* and *Datta* are the surnames of either the Kāyasthas or the Vaidyas. It is true that they were not unknown in the inferior castes. But as the bearers of these names in the Sena grants were *dūtakas* and *Sāndhivigrahakas*, it is reasonable to suppose that they were either the Kāyasthas or the Vaidyas. It should be noted that many surnames are found to be used both by the Kāyasthas and the Vaidyas. For example, the surnames *Datta*, *Deva*, *Dāsa*, *Nāga*, *Soma*, *Nandi*, *Dhara*, etc., are quite common to both the castes; so when a *Datta* and a *Nāga* are mentioned in the grants as *dūtaka* or *Sāndhivigrahaka* all that we can say of them is that they were either Kāyastha or Vaidya officials. That the Vaidyas were an influential caste under the Sena rulers is evident from many of the passages of the *Chandraprabhā*

which is a *Kulapañjikā* or genealogical account of the Vaidyas. This book was composed in Śaka 1597 or A.D. 1675 by Bharatamallika, and its genuineness has never been doubted. It is expressly stated in this book that Umāpatidhara (no doubt the poet who composed Deopara inscription) was the *biji* or the first founder of the *Dhara* family of the Vaidyas of Bengal.¹ The same book also refers to *Dvayi* or Dhuyī (also called Dhui) as the *viji* of the Śakṛgotra of the Vaidyas.² This Dvayī or Dhuyī received *Kaulinya* or Kulinism from Vallāla.³ He was thus a contemporary of Vallāla and Lakshmaṇa and has been identified with the poet Dhoyī. It is interesting to know in this connection that Dr. Dinesh Chandra Sen, the author of the *History of Bengali Language and Literature* and a Professor of the Calcutta University, claims descent from this Dhoyī. Thus when two of the foremost poets of the Sena court are said to have belonged to the Vaidya caste, we may easily conclude that the Vaidyas held high position in the state and were an important factor in the society. The Rāmpāl plate of Śrī Chandra reveals a line of Brāhmaṇas whose surnames end in Gupta (Śarman).⁴ No such Brahmanas are met with in the modern Bengal. Where have they gone? Have they too, like the *Sena-Karṇāṭakshatriyas*, merged into the present Vaidya caste of Bengal? ⁵ As regards the position of the Kāyasthas in the Sena empire we know nothing authentically beyond the fact that Hari Ghosha was a *Sāndhivigrahaka* of Vallāla. *Ghosha*, as we have just now remarked, is a typical Kāyastha surname and so when we have a Kāyastha, Hari Ghosha, mentioned as a *Sāndhivigrahaka*, we can say with assurance that in those days the Kāyasthas like the Vaidyas

¹ Chandraprabhā, p. 21.

² *Ibid*, p. 213.

³ Sadvaidyakulapañjikā by Kavikanthahāra, pp. 1-2.

⁴ Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 139.

⁵ The names of the Brāhmaṇas are :—(1) Makara Gupta, (2) Varāha Gupta, (3) Sumaṅgala Gupta, (4) Pitavāsa Gupta Sarman, Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 139,

were an influential caste and held important status in the state as well as in the society.

The Brāhmaṇas were highly esteemed and in this period as in all others in the history of India, they successfully maintained their supremacy. They exercised immense influence in temporal as well as spiritual matters and often held eminent position in the government of the country. Thus Halāyudha, the author of the *Brāhmaṇasarvasva*, was in his youth a minister of Lakshmaṇa and rose to be a *dharmādhyakṣa* in his old age. His elder brother Paśupati, who was like him also a *Smṛti* writer, rose to the rank of *Rājapaṇḍita*. In religious matters their position was supreme and uncontested. There was a regular post of *mahāpurohita* under all the Sena kings and the Sena rulers and their wives used to give wealth to the Brāhmaṇas and grant lands to them in accordance with the injunctions of the *Smṛti*. There were really very learned Brāhmaṇas and among them some geniuses of the first water. Jayadeva was a Brāhmaṇa and in the domain of poetry his genius soared very high. His wonderful lyrics are still fascinating the imagination of the world. Regarding the history of the castes other than the Brāhmaṇas, the Vaidyas and the Kāyasthas, our sources of information are very scanty and meagre and not often based on real historical evidence. About the position of the Suvarṇavaṇikas the *Vallālacharita* says that formerly they used to wear sacred threads and their influence and position in the society were by no means low. But it was the king Vallāla who deprived them for the first time of their right of wearing sacred threads and degraded their position in the society on account of some arrogance on the part of their leaders.

Now we come to two other castes which are mentioned in all the Sena records. They are worth mentioning because they were important both socially and politically. They were the *Chattas* and the *Bhattas* who are referred to in all

the Sena records in the fiscal portion of the grants. It appears that they had certain rights connected either with the land or their owners. We are here of course adverting to the phrase *a-Chaṭṭa-Bhaṭṭa-praveśāḥ* a phrase which is also found in the charters of the other parts of India. In the Valabhi copper-plate, for instance, the expression is *a-chūṭa-Bhāṭa praveśaḥ*. The word *Chūṭa* of this expression corresponds to *Chaṭṭa* of the Sena records and the *Bhāṭa* of the former is of course a mistake for *Bhaṭṭa* of the latter. Who were then these *Chaṭṭas* and the *Bhaṭṭas*? Pandit Bhagwan Lal Indrajī has drawn our attention to the expression *Chāṭa Bhāṭa* of the *Kumārapāla-charita*.¹ There we are told that Siddharāja despatched these *Chaṭṭas* and the *Bhaṭṭas* to apprehend Kumārapāla who was then a fugitive. The *Bhāṭas* or the *Bhaṭṭas* must evidently be the modern *Bhāṭs* who were up till recently an influential caste over the greater portion of India, especially in Rajputana, Guzarat and the Deccan. They were formerly professional genealogists and as such they often found easy entrance to every house. In this way they were very helpful to the government. They would often be employed to detect fugitives. They would go by turn to every village and every house, their ostensible object being to recite the genealogy and sing the praise of the members of the household but their real object being to search out the fugitive. They were sometimes very oppressive and used to exact money from the people in some novel way. And this is probably why they are prohibited in the charters of the Sena kings as in other records, from entering the land granted to a Brāhmaṇa. About their oppressive nature the "Tribes and Castes of Bombay"² has the following interesting statement:—"Bhāṭas had some time ago a ready way of extracting money for the fulfilment of a pledge made to them. If a man refused to keep a promise made to

¹ Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part I, pp. 81-2.

² Tribes and Castes of Bombay, pp. 123-30.

them they committed *trāgo* as it was called, *i.e.*, brought a girl or an old woman of their family to the house of the defaulter and threatened to kill or actually did kill her ; and if these means failed, the *Bhāt* used to proceed to plunge a dagger into his breast. The disgrace of these proceedings and the fear of having a bard's blood on their head, generally reduced the most obstinate to reason." *Bhāts* are found even to this day in certain parts of Eastern Bengal. They frequent the house of wealthy country gentlemen on great occasions and sing ballads. Among the most popular ballads are those dealing with the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa and the story of Rājā Rajvallabha of Rājanagar. The *Chattas*¹ were most probably a criminal tribe like the modern Berads and Ramoshis who are principally found in Belgaum, Bijaypur, Dharwar and the Southern Maratha country. How these *Chattas* may be oppressive to the society would appear from the habits and customs of these Berads and Ramoshis. Thus it is recorded of the Berads that "they were formerly a war-like and dangerous class, notorious as thieves and highway robbers. In the Belgaum district even now, some of them are clever thieves, skilful in eluding search and hiding stolen property, and are much feared by travellers. They steal cattle with such cleverness and send the stolen animals to such a long distance that the greatest energy and caution often fail to find any trace of them. The owner has to go and ask the Berads' help, and if he promises a reward, the animal is found and restored. If an animal is missing, it is almost sure to have fallen into the hands of the Berads."²

As regards the primary social institution of marriage it may be noted that it did not reach the rigid form in which we find it now. In fact, interprovincial and intercaste marriages were not unknown in the Sena period. From the

¹ Pandit Bhagwan Lal Indraji takes *Chattas* to mean cheats or rogues. *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Pt. I, pp. 81-82.

² *Tribes and Castes of Bombay*, by R. E. Enthoven, Vol. I, pp. 78-90.

various grants of the Sena kings we come to know that they were *Brahmakshatriyas* and *Karṇāṭakshatriyas*. But we have already seen that Vijayasena married in the Śūra family of the Suhmadeśa. This is an instance of interprovincial marriage. Again the *Chandraprabhā* informs us that Vallāla's daughter's son was a Vaidya.¹ This means that Vallāla's daughter who was evidently a Kshatriya girl was married to a Vaidya. This appears to be an instance of intercaste marriage. Babu Nagendra Nath Basu has found out a tradition to the effect that Vallāla himself married a Kāyastha girl and according to the *Vallālacharita* he even took a bride from the Charmakāra caste and married her according to the *Gāndhārva* form.² It is also mentioned in the *Chandraprabhā*³ that both Lakshmaṇa and his son Keśava contracted matrimonial alliances with Vaidya families.

The institution of *devadāsī*, now looked down upon, was not unknown in the period under review. It is stated in the Deopara inscription that king Vijaya "provided a hundred lovely female (attendants) whose bodily charms were heightened by jewel ornaments," for the Pradyumneśvara Śiva (V. 30). Dhoyī the author of the *Paranādūta* also in a verse mentions the *devadāsī* or the temple girls of Śiva (*Pavanadūta*, V. 29). The custom of dedicating *devadāsīs* to shrines is only seen now-a-days in the district of Southern Malabar and the regions thereabout. The natural inference from this fact is that most probably the Sena kings brought this institution along with them from their original home Karṇāṭa.

Gold ornaments and jewelleryes were of course used by the ladies of high castes. But it is also interesting to note that the Brāhmaṇa ladies used palm-leaf ear-rings. Conch-shell bangles were also worn by ladies, a practice which is still current in Bengal. But it seems to have fallen into

¹ *Chandraprabhā*, p. 189.

² *Vallālacharita*, Chap. III.

³ *Chandraprabhā*, pp. 222 and 364

desuetude in other parts of India. They painted their feet with lac-dye and used saffron and musk for toilets.

We have heard much about Kulinism, and Vallāla is mentioned times without number as the originator of this institution. But we find neither epigraphic nor satisfactory literary evidence about this origin. The advocates of this theory base their conclusions on the statement made in the *Kulapañjikās* which can hardly be relied upon as genuine historical evidence. And even among the *Kulapañjikākāras* themselves there are differences of opinion. In fact in an earlier *Kulapañjikā* mention has been made of an older view of Kulinism based on personal qualifications. The *Sadvaidyā-kulapañjikā* of Kavikanṭhahāra which was written in Śaka 1575 or 1653 A.D. says that there are two views regarding the institution of Kulinism. The older view is that it was based on nine personal qualifications such as *āchāra*, *vinaya*, *vidyā*, etc. But the more recent view is that it was for the first time created by king Vallāla in the family of Duhisena and others.¹ Clearly therefore we find that the institution of Kulinism was a very ancient one and it was based on certain personal qualifications and not made hereditary by anybody. The view that Vallāla was its originator only gained ground in comparatively recent times and as such cannot be credited with much authenticity.

One interesting feature of the society in the Sena period cannot be overlooked. About the end of the Deopara inscription we are told that the record was engraved by one Śūlapāṇi who is called not only "the crest-jewel of the guild of the Varendra artists" (*śilpi*) but also a *rāṇaka*. This shows that the province of Varendra was renowned for the appreciation and development of the fine arts. There is no meaning otherwise of our being told that there was a guild of artists in Varendra and that Śūlapāṇi was the head of it. That Varendra

¹ *Sadvaidyākulapañjika*, pp. 1-2.

had made itself famous long before Śūlapāṇi is clear from the fact that Tārānāth in his *History of Buddhism in India* tells us that even as early as the time of Dharmapāla and Devapāla of the Bāla dynasty there were two artists, father and son, called Dhīmān and Bītpāla who founded a school not only in cast metal work but also in sculpture and painting. It was known as the eastern or Magadhan school and replaced the old west school not only in the territory of Gauda but also in the country of Nepal. Varendra had thus been already known as a home of original artists—a conclusion supported by the exuberance of sculptures of one typical style found all over Rajshahi, Dinajpur, Bogra and Pabna districts which represent Varendra. There is another point to be noticed in connection with Śūlapāṇi. He has been called a *rāṇaka*. In the administrative history section of this thesis we have stated that *rāṇaka* denoted as high a rank as *rājan*, *rājanyaka* and so forth. If they were not all feudatory titles some of them denoted at least the pick of the landed gentry. And Śūlapāṇi when he is designated as *rāṇaka* is to be taken as to be a fairly big zemindar. This is interesting because he could have risen only to this high position by his eminent success in the sphere of art. What is more probable is that his family must have been brought to great prominence by his great-grand-father. For, not only his name but also those of his father and grand-father and even great-grand-father have been specified. What is the good of mentioning all these names unless we are to infer that they denoted a dynastic list of artists who made themselves conspicuous by their skill and originality in *śilpa*. Probably, therefore, the family began to acquire importance in the time of the great-grand-father of Śūlapāṇi and as they or at least Śūlapāṇi could come to assume the rank of a *rāṇaka* it indicates that art in the Sena period was looked upon as an honourable and lucrative profession so as to enable an artist of exceptional merit to rise to an aristocratic position in society.

CHAPTER V.

Religious History.

We have finished our survey of the political, administrative, fiscal and social history of the period, and we now come to the history of religion under the Sena rulers. It is not less important than the previous ones. In fact it is essential to the understanding of the moral life of the people. The principal religions of India that have dominated the lives and thoughts of the people are of course (1) Buddhism, (2) Brahmanism, and (3) Jainism, with their different ramifications. Now let us ascertain what was the state of each of these three kinds of religion in the Sena kingdom of Bengal.

Buddhism in Bengal which was in a flourishing condition in the early Pāla period was at a low ebb towards its close and by the time when the Senas came to power it had begun to lose its separate identity as one of the principal religions, Buddha having found a place in the Brahmanic pantheon as one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu.

We know from Kshemendra who flourished in Kashmir in the eleventh century that in his time Buddha had already been admitted into the Brahmanic pantheon as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. But when the same happened in Bengal we do not know, till we come to the period of Jayadeva who lived in the court of Lakshmaṇa. This is evident from the *Gita-govinda* where Jayadeva in a well-known verse in praise of Viṣṇu speaks of Buddha as an *avatāra* of that supreme god. In the time of Lakshmaṇa we then clearly find Buddha

absorbed in the Brahmanic pantheon. But though Buddhism as a separate religion was in a decadent state it did not certainly vanish from the land. The Sena rulers though they belonged to the Brahmanic religion, the first two being Śaiva, and the last three Vaiṣṇava, were not intclerant zealots, and we often find either from the grants of these rulers or from the literature of the period that there were regular Buddhist temples in the land and the great Buddhist scholars like Mahāmahopādhyaya Purushottamadasa and Śaraṇadeva flourished under the benevolent patronage of these Sena kings.¹ But that Buddhism was declining at this period is clear from the fact that there are no grants to Buddhist temples or Buddhist monks made by royal donors or private individuals. In fact, there is no inscription whether engraved on stone or copper-plate which records such a grant.

Both Purushottama and Śaraṇa were grammarians and lived in the court of Lakshmaṇa. It is a noteworthy fact that though Śaraṇa was a Buddhist by religion he was warmly praised for his scholarship by such a devout Vaiṣṇava as Jayadeva.² As a matter of fact the followers of Buddhist and Brahmanic faith lived side by side in amity, and if we are to believe in the statement made in the *Vallālacharita*, the Buddhist priests, though they lost much of their spiritual hold over the people, often acquired considerable temporal power and sometimes managed to obtain the proprietorship even of the Brahmanic temples. Thus it is said in the seventh chapter of the *Vallālacharita* that Dharmagiri who was addressed as *bhadanta* was the proprietor (*Sthānādhipa*) of the temple of Śaṅkara in Mahāsthāna.

If Buddhism as a separate religion was falling into decadence under the Senas of Bengal, the case was otherwise with Brāhmanism. As a matter of fact the period of the Sena rule in Bengal was the period of the revival of Brahmanic religion.

¹ Introduction to *Bhashavritti*, edited by Prof. Sris Chandra Chakravarty, pp. 487.

² *Ibid*, p. 7.

The Sena rulers, being of Brahmanic faith, whole-heartedly supported its cause. The inscription and the grants of these rulers as well as the works of literary men of the period tell us that under their benevolent patronage the temples of various deities belonging to the Brahmanic pantheon such as the Pradyumneśvara Śiva,¹ Ardhanārīśvara Śiva, Murāri, and Śūrya² were regularly built all over the country and their worship was performed with great pomp and ceremony. A general revival of *Smṛti* literature which greatly advanced the cause of Brahmanic cult also took place during this period. And in the list of the *Smṛti* writers we meet with the names of such erudites as Aniruddhabhaṭṭa, Halāyudha, Paśupati and Īśāṇa. Besides, king Vallāla wrote a treatise on *Smṛti*. As a result of this revival in *Smṛti* learning we find the rulers of the Sena dynasty or their royal consorts regularly performing various kinds of sacrifices or making gifts to the Brahmanas belonging to the diverse branches of the Vedic learning in accordance with the injunctions of *Smṛti*. Thus for instance, we find from the Barrackpur grant of Vijayasena that queen Vilāsadevi made a grant of land as a *dakṣiṇā* for the performance of *homa* at the time of the *tulāpurushamahādāna* ceremony on the occasion of a lunar eclipse to Udayakaradeva Śarman, a student of the Āśvalāyana śākhā of *Rgveda*. Similarly we find from the Naihati record of Vallālasena that the grant was made by the king as a *dakṣiṇā* of the golden-horse-gift ceremony performed by his mother, the same Queen Vilāsadevi on the occasion of a solar eclipse to the illustrious Ovāsudeva, a student of the Kauthuma śākhā of the Sāmaveda. Again the Tarpanadighi grant of Lakshmaṇa was issued on the occasion of a ceremony known as the *hemā-svaratha* gift (one of the sixteen gifts mentioned in the *Matsyapurāṇa*). The donee of this grant was Īśvaradeva Śarman, a student of the Kauthuma branch of the *Sāmaveda*.

¹ Deopara Inscription, v. 26.

² Pavanadūta, vs. 28-30.

The principal feature of this Brahmanic revival was, as we have already remarked, that it embraced Buddhism in its fold and gave Buddha a lasting place in its pantheon as one of the incarnations of the great god Vishṇu. Another noteworthy fact about this Brāhmanic revival was that a new Vaiṣṇava cult—the cult of Rādhā—sprang into prominence for the first time in this period. No doubt Rādhā as a shepherdess and beloved of Kṛṣṇa not only appears in the tenth century inscription of Vākpatirāja (974 A. D.), the *Daśāvatāracharita* of Kshemendra and the various *Purāṇas*, but also in the famous book of fables, *Pañchatantra*, where the phrase, “*Rādhā nāmā me bhōryā Gopakula prasutā*,” occurs. But it appears that the cult of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, upon which the whole superstructure of the latter-day Vaiṣṇava religion of Bengal was raised, gained regular force and vigour during the Sena rule in Bengal. And to this newly born cult the melodious poet of Lakshmaṇasena’s court, Jayadeva, gave an eternal charm and beauty. The other aspects of the Brahmanic cult were not also wanting. In fact all the principal gods and goddesses of the Hindu pantheon were worshipped. And it appears from the *Pavanadūta* that the sun-worship which had now disappeared from India was in vogue in Bengal at the time as the author mentions the existence of an image of Raghukulaguru (*i.e.*, Surya) in Sumhadeśa.¹ As regards the prevalence of Tāntrika worship we have as yet got no genuine evidence either epigraphic or literary to that effect. Babu Nagendra Nath Basu thinks that King Vallāla was a Tāntrika worshipper and through his efforts Tantrism spread into Orissa from Bengal.² But this assertion of his is mainly based on the statement of the Bengal Ghaṭakas, and as such cannot be relied upon with much force.

The existence of Jainism in the Sena period too, like Tantrism, cannot be traced with much force and definiteness.

¹ *Pavanadūta*, v. 30.

² *Archaeological Survey of Mayurbhanja*, p. 4 xiv.

At least no grants of the Sena kings or no literary works of the period bear any testimony to that effect. Babu Rakhaldas Banerji has found among the ruins of the pre-Mahomedan period of Saptagrama¹ some Jaina images. But these may belong to the period of the Pāla kings or a period earlier still.

¹ J. A. S. B., 1909, p. 274.

CHAPTER VI.

Literary History.

We now come to the literary history of the Sena period—a history which can well be a source of pride and joy to a Bengali. For the Sena rule may rightly be described as the Augustan period of Sanskrit learning in Bengal. Science and art have all along flourished in India under the patronage of royal dynasties. It would take us too long to describe from the beginning how royal patronage had created literary activities and fostered their growth. One of the misfortunes of India was that the country was many a time invaded by foreigners most of whom belonged to the more or less uncivilised barbarian hordes. But the noteworthy point about the Hindu civilisation is that all these foreigners, *mlechhas* though they were, were gradually mollified under Indian environments and imbibed not only Hindu language and culture but also Hindu faith. When about the beginning of the sixth century A. D. the Huna eruptions perturbed and darkened the political firmament, it was feared that the Hindu civilisation was in some danger. But here too that civilisation demonstrated its mollifying and edifying influence. The foreign swarms were Hinduised one after another in quick succession and from the eighth to the eleventh century A. D. the royal family which wielded sway over the whole of northern India were the imperial Pratihāras, who, as we know at present, belonged to the Gurjara (Khazar) and therefore foreign race. Not only did they adopt Hindu names but even traced their pedigree from Lakshmaṇa, brother of Rāma, the hero of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the ornament of the solar race. So steeped were they in Hindu culture that they began their patronage even to Sanskrit learning. Their most notable protégé was the famous poet Rājaśekhara. When the Pratihāra power declined, their

empire was split up into a number of smaller kingdoms such as the Chalukyas (Solānkis) and Chāhamanas in Guzarat and Rajputana, the Paramāras in Malwa and the Pālas in U. P., Bihar and Bengal. The kings of all these dynasties kept the torch of Sanskrit learning burning and held it aloft. But perhaps the greatest celebrity among them was the Paramara king Bhoja of Dhārā and Ujjayinī. His encouragement and development of science and art were so munificent and extensive that his name has been rightly compared to Vikramāditya, the traditional patron of learning in India. This desire to give encouragement to Sanskrit learning was by no means unknown during the Pāla rule in Bengal. But by far the greatest impetus we find given to it when the Senas came to power. The characteristic feature of the literary activity in the Sena period is that most of their protégés were natives of Bengal and what is noteworthy about it is that this activity displayed itself not merely in the sphere of *Sahitya* or composition but also in the abstruse fields of Grammar, *Smṛti* or law and *Nyāya*.

What could be the cause of the splendid array of these *literati* who were ornaments of the Sena court? The reply obviously is, that the Sena kings were liberal in their patronage to the learned men of their time. But the question again is why were they so liberal. We might as well ask why was the Paramāra king Bhoja so liberal. The only reply to this question is that Bhoja himself was a learned prince and we may add that at least three of the Sena rulers were learned kings and we may further assert without any fear of contradiction that two of these Sena kings again, namely, Vallāla and Lakshmaṇa were as learned as Bhoja himself. These two Sena kings and their successor Keśava are credited with having composed Sanskrit poems. But the composition of a Sanskrit poem, though such a thing may be admired of a prince, is yet in itself not such a product as requires much thought and imagination. What has rendered the names of Vallāla and his son Lakshmaṇa famous in the annals of

Bengal is not the few Sanskrit poems that stand to their credit but certainly the production of two encyclopaedic works. The first namely, the *Dānasāgara*, which was completed in A. D. 1169-70, sets forth the various kinds of *dānas* or gifts and various ceremonies connected therewith. Vallāla seems to have been so fond of Sanskrit composition that as the *Dānasāgara* was being brought to a completion, he started the compilation of another encyclopaedic work the *Abdhūtasāgara* which deals with omens and portents. Unfortunately, however, he died on the banks of the Ganges before he could finish it. But the learned father had a learned son, and the work was resumed and completed by Lakshmaṇa. Bengal was lucky in the fact that it had two consecutive kings who were not only patrons of learning but were themselves learned men. Malwa had only one Paramāra king, namely, Bhoja, who could be compared to them. But Bengal was more unfortunate in another respect. The distress in the case of Paramāra kingdom was caused by the temporary preponderance of another but Hindu dynasty and though the line of Bhoja was extinct the Paramāra power was soon thereafter re-established at Dhārā by a collateral branch of the Paramāra dynasty. Such was, however, not the case with Bengal. In the closing years of Lakshmaṇa's reign the Mahomedan power was becoming stronger and though the Sena rule lingered one or two generations after Lakshmaṇa in some parts of Bengal, the original splendour of the Sena dynasty had completely vanished, and just as on a dark night one or two streaks of lightning may dazzle and stupefy human eye which may afterwards be enveloped in a sea of darkness, so Bengal was effulgent with extreme and manifold literary activity which lasted for at least three generations and was then immersed in a pitchy blind darkness from which it did not rise up for two centuries.

Who were the literary men, the votaries of arts and science, that flourished in the Sena court, especially when

Vallāla and his son Lakshmaṇa were reigning? We shall divide them under four classes as already indicated, *viz.*, (1) *Sāhitya*, (2) *Smṛiti*, (3) Grammar and (4) *Nyāya*. In this connection I cannot help referring to seven illuminating papers which the late Rai Manomohan Chakravarty Bahadur wrote on the subject. In these he had brought together a mass of materials from which a mightier pen could easily and beautifully describe the literary activity of the period. Taking first *Sāhitya* or poetry and poetics we find no less than twelve poets who figured prominently in this sphere. One of the most celebrated poets of this age was according to the modern estimate Jayadeva the author of the *Gītagovinda* who flourished in the court of Lakshmaṇa. Almost at the beginning of his work he cites in a verse the names of no less than four poets side by side with his own specifying the salient feature of the composition of each. As Jayadeva here associates himself with four poets, the latter must be of great eminence in his time. In this verse Jayadeva does not glorify himself at the expense of others as no doubt the verse has been so interpreted by the commentators and following them the modern scholars. What Jayadeva has done here is that he has singled out five poets of the Sena court including himself and described what in his opinion constitutes the *forte* or characteristic quality of the writings of each. The names of these five are (1) Umāpatidhara, (2) Jayadeva, (3) Śaraṇa, (4) Govardhana, (5) Dhoyī. It is not quite clear whether the order in which he has mentioned these names shows that the succeeding was looked upon as of a higher rank than that of the preceding name, in the hierarchy of *literati* then prevalent. At any rate, Dhoyī the last mentioned seems to have been looked upon as the poet-laureate of the Sena court because Jayadeva calls him *Kavikshmāpati* *i.e.*, the king of the poets. This agrees with what Dhoyī has said of himself about the end of his work, the *Paṇadūta*. There he styles himself as the paramount lord of the kings

viz., the poets! We will now give a short description of each.

(1) *Umāpati*.—Nothing particularly is known about the residence and family history of this poet. He has not given any. He most probably adorned the courts of three successive Sena kings from Vijaya to Lakṣmaṇa. That he was the court-poet of king Vijaya is known from his having composed the Deopara inscription of that king. That he also lived in the reign of Lakṣmaṇa appears from the fact that Śrīdhara-dāsa, the compiler of the *Saduktikarṇāmr̥ta*, quotes a verse of his in praise of his (*i.e.*, Śrīdhara-dāsa's) father Vaṭudāsa in his anthology. Vaṭudāsa was a friend and officer of Lakṣmaṇa Sena. His principal poetical composition so far known to us is, besides more than a hundred stray verses quoted in various anthologies, his Deopara *pr̥śasti*. It was such an excellent piece of poetical eminence that no less than four verses from it (Vs. 7, 23, 24 and 30) have been cited in the *Saduktikarṇāmr̥ta*. The very fact that the anthologist has quoted some verses from this composition shows that it was not only engraved on a stone slab at Deopara and remained there, but manuscript copies of it must have been made by others for their perusal and recitation. Śrīdhara-dāsa, the anthologist quotes no less than 94 stanzas of his. Jayadeva's statement "*Vāchaḥ paṭlavayati Umāpatidharaḥ*"—"Umapatidhara makes words as beautiful and tender as the young sprouts," is very apt. With this may be compared what Umāpatidhara has said of himself in the Deopara inscriptions. He describes himself as possessed of "understanding purified by the study of words and their meaning." Doubtless he was the true master of words. Some of his verses are really very mellifluous. It was not unlikely that he is identical with the person of the same name mentioned in the *Chandraprabhā* of Bharata Mallika, and the ancestor of Vaidyaś, to which we have referred in the 'Social History' section.

(2) *Jayadeva*.—He, of all the poets of the Sena court, is the only one who has gained all-India reputation and who is still read and loved by the scholars and the ordinary people alike. His name is a household word in Bengal and his influence in shaping the subsequent Bengali literature was not insignificant. He is practically the forerunner of the Vaisnava literature of Bengal—a class of literature which is immensely popular and which has consoled and still consoles many a poor forlorn soul. Such is the immense hold of Jayadeva on the minds of the Bengali poets that even such a great and eminent poet as Rabindra Nath Tagore is not free from it. The characteristic sweetness and softness of language that are visible in the poems of Rabindranath are, it is believed, the outcome of his reading Jayadeva extensively. He has read the lyrics of Jayadeva so thoroughly that sometimes he quotes Jayadeva *verbatim*, without being perhaps conscious of it. For instance, Jayadeva has, ‘*alikula-saṅkula kusuma-samuhe nirākula-vakula-kalāpe*’ (*Gīta*. v. 29) and Rabindra Nath writes *Nirākula phulabhāre vakula vāgāna*. It seems, Jayadeva obtained this popularity far earlier. The manuscript copies of the *Gītagovinda* lie scattered all over India from Nepal and Kashmir downwards and no less than 37 commentaries of the *Gītagovinda* have so far been found, the earliest known among them being the *Rasikapriyā* by the powerful king of Udaipur, Kumbhakarna who belonged to the 15th century. It is a matter of great regret that very little is known about Jayadeva authentically. Mithilā, Orissa and Bengal, each has claimed him to be her own. Manomohan Babu has examined each of the traditions claiming Jayadeva to be an Oria, a Maithili or a Bengali, and he is of opinion that the tradition which says that he was a native of Bengal is the most reliable.¹ The name of Jayadeva’s home which appears in the second line of III, 10 is

¹ J.A.S.B., 1906, p. 167.

variously read as Kenduvilva, Kenduvilla, Kendubilva, Kendubilla, Sindubilva and Tinduvilva.' The tradition of Bengal identifies it with modern Kenduli in the district of Birbhum on the north bank of the river Ajaya where an annual fair in memory of the poet is still held on the last day of the month of Māgha. Some of the manuscripts of the *Gitagovinda* give the name of his father as Bhojadeva, of his mother as Ramā and his friend as Parāśara. But as these passages are not found in such old commentaries as the *Rasikapriyā* they are very doubtful. According to traditions the wife of Jayadeva was Padmābatī. Such passages in the *Gitagovinda* as *Padmāvati-charana-ohārana-chakravartī* (first half of 1. 2) and *Padmāvati-ramaṇi-Jayadeva-kavibhārati bhanita matiśātana*, etc., seem to corroborate the tradition.² But as the old commentaries like the *Rasikapriyā* do not support the reading we are not justified in asserting our own view in one way or the other. The posterior limit of Jayadeva's time is fixed by his verses being quoted in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* which was composed in A.D. 1206. The anterior limit is ascertained from the mention of Dhoyī and other poets in 1. 4. In all probability he could not have flourished earlier than the reign of Lakshmaṇasena.

(3) *Sarana*.—According to Manomohan Babu no work of this scholar has yet been discovered. Only stray verses of his are quoted in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*. But we now know that he was a grammarian first and a poet afterwards, and his commentary on Pāṇini has been found.³ We shall say more of him when we shall come to describe the grammarians of the Sena period.

(4) *Achārya Govardhana*.—He wrote a work called the *Āryāsaptasatī* in imitation of Hāla's Prākṛt work the *Gāthāsaptasatī*. It is called the *Āryāsaptasatī* because its verses consisting of 755 stanzas in all, are written in *Āryā* metre.

¹ *Ibid*, pp. 163-5.

² *Ibid*, p. 166.

³ Introduction to *Bhāṣāhvṛtti* by Prof. Sris Ch. Chakravarty, p. 4.

It was a work of erotic character. This probably led Jayadeva to remark '*Śṛṅgār-ottara-sat-prameya-rachanair-āchārya-Govardhana*' (Sarga I, v. 4). The posterior limit of his time is fixed by this reference in the *Gītagovinda*. The anterior limit is fixed by his mention of a Sena king as his patron in the verse 39 of the poem. He belonged to a class of Brāhmaṇas belonging to the *Putitūṇḍa* family. After the fall of the Sena power he is said to have taken up his residence at a village in the modern district of Backergunge, which is called after him Govardhana. His descendants are still to be found at the neighbouring villages of Bamrail, Solak and Nalchira.¹

(5) *Dhoyī*.—He is the celebrated author of the *Pavanadūta*, a short poetical work written evidently in imitation of Kālidāsa's famous work, *Meghadūta*. He has been called *Kavikshmāpati* by Jayadeva. More light is thrown upon this matter by the account which the poet gives about himself at the end of his work. In v. 101, he says that being "the paramount lord of the kings, namely the poets," he obtained from the king of Gauḍa a host of elephants caparisoned in gold and the gold-handled chowry. This clearly shows that he was looked upon as the poet-laureate of the Sena court. The same verse is quoted in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* but with the second half entirely different. Why the second half differs it is difficult to say. But that occurring in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* tells us that Dhoyī attained in the Sena court to as much eminence as Vararuchi did in the assembly of Vikramāditya by means of the quality of being a *śrūtidhara*. What *śrūtidhara* most probably means is "one who can recite what he hears but once." Vararuchi was noted for this memory feat, and Dhoyī evidently seems to have excelled in that art. Verse 102 of the *Pavanadūta* says that, among many other things, he is longing for

(i) *Vaidarbharti* or Vidarbha style of composition so far as the arrangements of words is concerned,

¹ Bākala by Rohini Kumar Sen, p. 320.

- (ii) residence on the banks of the Ganges, and
- (iii) the office of an *āchārya* of the kings.

Now with regard to the first item there can be no doubt that the *Pavanadūta* exhibits the Vaidharbha style almost to a perfection. As regards the second matter, as he was in the capital of the Sena kingdom he was naturally on the banks of the holy river. The third point, however, is not quite clear, for as the *Pavanadūta* was composed in honour of Lakshmanasena, as we shall shortly see, he was the protégé of that Sena prince and when therefore he expresses his longing to be an *āchārya* to kings, this can be taken to refer to the members of the Sena dynasty only. And it is not at all impossible that he was an *āchārya* to this royal family for three generations from Vijaya down to Lakshmana. The last verse, namely, v. 104, expresses the resolution of his mind to fix itself on Brahma by residing on the banks of the Ganges apparently in a temple of Śiva. This shows that the *Pavanadūta* was the last of his compositions. It has been suggested by some scholars that Dhoyī Kavikshmāpati is identical with Dhuyi or Dvayī who is mentioned in the *Chandraprabhā* as the ancestor of Vaidyas belonging to a branch of the Saktrigotra. The title Kavikshmāpati is equivalent to 'Kavirāja' the modern designation of the Vaidyas of Bengal. The story of the *Pavanadūta* in brief is this:—Once upon a time king Lakshmanasenadeva while on an expedition for world conquest went to the Sandal hill where there was a town of the Gandharvas. The daughter of the Gandharva king, Kuvalayavatī by name, seeing the charm and beauty of the person of the king, at once fell in love with him. Then in order to communicate her love tidings to the king Lakshmana, she prayed to the wind to be her messenger and deliver her tale of woe to the king who resided in Gauda. Then she describes the various countries and routes through which the bearer of her love message is to pass in order to reach Vijayapura, the capital of her beloved. The story ends

with the final instruction by the lady to the messenger regarding the manner in which the news of her pangs and sufferings caused on account of her separation from the king, should be communicated to him.

Besides these five far-famed poets there were many lesser luminaries in the Sena court whose stray verses have been preserved in the *Saduktikarnāmrta*. They are :— (1) *Udayana*.—He was a pupil of Āchārya Govardhana and revised his poem the *Āryāsaptasati*. (2) *Dharma Joṣeśvara*.—One verse of his is quoted in the *Saduktikarnāmrta*. This is in praise of a gift of one Gaudendra. (3) *Bala-bhadra*.—He was like Udayana a pupil of Govardhana and revised his poem. (4) *Madhu*.—The *Saduktikarnāmrta* quotes some eight verses of the *dharmādhyaksha* or judge Madhu. One of his verses praises the anthologist's father Vaṭudāsa as the right hand staff of Lakshmaṇasena. (5) *Vetāla, Bhaṭṭa Vetāla or Rājā Vetāla*.—Śrīdharadāsa quotes one verse of this writer which is in high praise of Vaṭudāsa. (6) *Vyāsa*.—He too praises Vaṭudāsa. (7) *Saṅcādhara*.—Śrīdharadāsa quotes one verse of his which is also in praise of Vaṭudāsa.

The famous anthologist *Śrīdharadāsa* closes our review of the Sāhityakāras of the Sena court. He was the celebrated compiler of the *Saduktikarnāmrta*, and but for him it would have not been possible for us to give this brief history of the poets. He was a widely read man and of great culture, as his compilation unmistakably proves. He has compiled about two thousand and four hundred verses from more than four hundred and fifty authorities named and unnamed. They have been judiciously, and tastefully selected and cover a wide range of subjects. His father was the celebrated Mahāsāmanta Vaṭudāsa. This shows that the latter was a feudatory chieftain. Śrīdharadāsa calls himself a *Mahāmaṇḍalika* or a ruler of a *maṇḍala*, in the colophon and

at the end of each *pravāha*. The anthology was compiled in 1207 A. D.¹

Having thus described the poets of the Sena period we now come to the grammarians. Of the grammarians of this period the two learned scholars whose names and works have been handed down to us were Purushottamadāsa and Śaraṇadeva. Both these scholars were Buddhists by religion and based their works on Pāṇini.² The former scholar wrote a partial commentary on Pāṇini called the *Bhāṣhāvṛtti*.³ Besides *Bhāṣhāvṛtti* various other works such as the lexicographies, *Hārāvali*, *Trikāṇḍaśeṣha*, *Varṇadūṣhṇa*, etc., and ritual works such as *Vishṇubhaktikalpalatā*, have been ascribed to him.⁴ Prof. Śrischandra Chakravarty who has recently published the *Bhāṣhāvṛtti* has found some ground which shows that its author was "most likely a Bengali."⁵ There is evidence both internal and external to associate him with the court of Lakṣmaṇa.⁶ The fact that there are many eulogistic references to Buddha and Buddhist theology in his *Bhāṣhāvṛtti* shows that he was a Buddhist writer.⁷

Śaraṇadeva the other grammarian of the Sena court composed *Durghaṭāvṛtti*, a work also based on Pāṇini.⁸ It was completed in A. D. 1172. In the beginning of the *Durghaṭāvṛtti* he says that his work was composed in 1095 Śaka or 1172 A. D. (*Śaka-mahīpati-vatsaramāṇe eka-nabho-nava-pañcha-vilāṇe*). As the date of *Durghaṭāvṛtti* is 1172 A. D., his time certainly coincides with that of Vallāla and Lakṣmaṇa. Therefore he is most probably the same Śaraṇadeva who has been mentioned by Jayadeva. Jayadeva says "Śaraṇa

¹ Colophon to the *Suduktikarnāmṛta*.

² *Bhāṣhāvṛtti*, Introduction, p. 1 ff.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Introduction to *Bhāṣhāvṛtti*, p. 18

is praiseworthy in liquefying the stiff " (*slāghyo durūha-drute*) because in his *Durghaṭavṛtti* " difficult passages apparently of doubtful grammatical accuracy from classical works, were very nicely justified." ¹ Nothing is as yet known about the nationality and family of this scholar.

It would be seen from the above account that these two grammarians kept alive in Bengal the study of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in its original form. It is well-known that Bhaṭṭojī Dikshit recast the *sūtras* of Pāṇini and taught the subject of grammar in a somewhat different fashion. Bengal, however, kept itself clear of it, and stuck to the orthodox mode of teaching Pāṇini which survived almost down to the beginning of the 19th century. The credit of it is largely due to the two grammarians of Bengal that flourished in the Sena period.

Among the *Smṛti* writers of Bengal during this period the most famous were the following four :—(1) Jīmūtavāhana ; (2) Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa, the preceptor of Vallālasena ; (3) King Vallāla and (4) Halāyudha. Besides these four writers there were two more *Smṛtikāras*. They were Paśūpati and Īśāna, the two brothers of Bhaṭṭa Halāyudha.

We have already made our remark about Vallāla and we now propose to take up the names of the remaining scholars of *Smṛti* one by one :—

1. *Jīmūtavāhana*.—He was by far the greatest *Smṛti* writer of the period. The Hindus of Bengal are still governed by his famous *Dāyabhāga*, specially in matters of marriage, succession and inheritance. So far only three of his works have been brought to light. These are (1) the *Kālaviveka*, (2) the *Vyavahāramātrikā* and (3) the *Dāyabhāga*.

The *Kālaviveka* deals with the appropriate months and seasons for the performance of religious duties and works, particularly lays stress on whether the prescribed months

should be lunar or solar. The *Vyavahāramātṛikā* (or the 'alphabets of legal procedure and evidence'), as the name signifies, describes "the procedure to be followed in the courts of law and nature of its evidence." The *Dāyabhāga*, by far the most important work of the three, was composed, as the learned writer himself tells us, "to settle the disputes among the learned men regarding the division of property on inheritance." There is very little which is of personal nature in the author's writings. In the colophons of his works he is very often styled as *Paribhādrīya Mahāmahopadhyāya*. In the last verse of the *Dāyabhāga* he is called *Paribhādrakulodbhūta-Śrīmān Jīmūtavāhana*. The word *Paribhādra* is said to be the same as the vernacular *Pāriḡāin*, a section of *Rāḍhiya Brāhmaṇas*. That he was a native of *Rāḍhā* can also be inferred from his contrast of *Rāḍhā* in the *Kālaviveka* with Ujjain, the Greenwich of the Hindu astronomical calculations. For instance, in one place the author says: "it (the star) rises in the last seven days of Bhādra in land beginning with *Rāḍhā* and in the last four days (thereof) in Ujjain." This contrast of *Rāḍhā* with Ujjain seems to indicate that *Rāḍhā* was the home-land of the author. According to Manomohan Babu, Jīmūtavāhana flourished in the first quarter of the 12th century A.D.

(2) *Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa*.—He was the preceptor of Vallālasena and a native of Varendrī. Babu Rajenera Lal Mitra's *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts* mentions two ritual works of one Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa. These are the *Suddhiviveka* and the *Hārulatā*. The name of this latter work together with that of Aniruddha occurs in a work of the 16th century called the *Suddhikaumudī*.

(3) *Halāyudha*.—He was the author of the *Mimāṃsā-sarvasva*, the *Vaiṣṇava-sarvasva*, the *Saina-sarvasva*, the *Paṇḍita-sarvasva* and the *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva*. By the latter work he is best known. The principal object in composing the *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva*, was to give to the *Brāhmaṇas* the

true and accurate meaning of the Vedic *mantras* such as are used in the daily *āhnikas* and the periodical *samśkāras*. In the introductory verses of the *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva*, the author has given a personal account of himself. From this we know that he was born in the *Vātsya gotra* and his father's name was Dhanañjaya. He had two brothers Paśupati and Īśāṇa. Of the three brothers, he was the youngest. He was appointed in his early age as the *rāja-paṇḍita* by King Lakshmaṇasena. In his youth he was given the post *Mahāmaha*t and honoured with 'umbrella bright as the moon' and towards the close of youth he was given the post of a judge.

(4) *Paśupati*.—He was the eldest brother of Halāyudha. In the introductory verses of the *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva*, Halāyudha says that Paśupati had written a manual or *paddhati* on *srāddha*, and another *paddhati* on *Pāka-yajña*. He also wrote *Daśakarma-paddhati*. In the colophon of this latter work he says that he was a *rāja-paṇḍita*.

(5) *Īśāṇa*.—He was the elder brother of Halāyudha. No manuscript of his work has as yet been found, but we know from the statement of Halāyudha in the *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva* that he was the author of a *paddhati* relating to *āhnikas* of the *Brāhmaṇas*.

Though the study of Nyāya had begun before the advent of the Sena kings and continued in the period under review and long after it, the name of any famous Nyāya scholar of the Sena empire is hardly met with. Manomohan Babu says that Gaṅgeśa-Upādhyāya, the famous founder of the Maithil school of the Nyāya system, flourished during the overlordship of Lakshmaṇasena.¹ But as we do not know definitely whether Mithilā was at any time under the Sena emperors of Bengal we cannot include him in the list of scholars who flourished under the benevolent patronage of the Sena rulers of Bengal.

¹ J. and Proc., A. S. B., 1915, p. 265.

Appendices.

APPENDIX A.

Lakshmaṇasena Era.

The famous controversy regarding the Lakshmaṇasena Era arose in this way:—

There were discovered a number of palm-leaf manuscripts chiefly in Nepal and written mainly in the Maithili character which were dated in *la. sa.* or Lakshmana samvat. In addition to these palm-leaf manuscripts there were found at Bodh Gaya three epigraphic records which were dated as follows:—

I. Lakshmaṇasenasya-atīta-rājye sam. 51.

II. Lakshmaṇasenadevapādānām atītarājye sam. 74, Vaiśākhavadi 12, Gurau.

III. Lakshmaṇasenasya-atīta-rājye sam. 84.

Now Prof. Kielhorn proved clearly from a calculation of the astronomical details, such as the name of the day, month and *tithi*, found in these manuscripts, that Lakshmaṇa samvat or *la. sa.* must have originated on October 7, A. D. 1119. The discussions about these era proceed from this finding of Dr. Kielhorn. All the rival scholars agree that it originated in 1119 A. D. But there is no consensus of opinion among them regarding the occasion of its origin and the interpretation of the term *atīta* in the Bodh Gaya inscriptions. These scholars may be divided for the sake of convenience into certain well-marked groups according to the views held by them.

According to the first group of scholars led by Mr. Rakhal-daś Banerji,¹ the era marks the accession of Lakshmaṇasena to the throne. They contend that Lakshmaṇasena came to the throne in A. D. 1119 and died before 1170 A. D. because the Bodh Gaya inscription No. I speaks of his reign as *atīta*

¹ Bānglār Itihāsa.

or a thing of the past. But this view cannot be tenable on the following grounds :—

(I) The testimony of the *Dānasāgara* and the *Adbhūtasāgara*, as we have already seen, is opposed to this view. A passage in the *Dānasāgara* says that the book was completed in 1168-69 A. D. by Vallāla, while it is written in the colophon of the *Adbhūtasāgara* that the work was begun by Vallāla in 1167-68 A. D. and completed by his son Lakshmaṇa after his death. Though Rakhaldaś Babu rejects those passages as spurious, this evidence is further corroborated by the celebrated *Tabakāt-i-Nāsiri* of Minhaj in which it is stated that Lakshmaṇasena was defeated by Bākht-yār between 1193 A. D. and 1205 A. D.

(II) The colophon of the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, as has been already pointed out, distinctly says that 1206 A. D. was the 21st year of the reign of Lakshmaṇasena, i.e., in other words Lakshmaṇasena came to the throne in 1185 A. D.

Therefore we see that the view of the first group of scholars cannot be maintained.

According to the second group of scholars¹ the era marks the accession of a predecessor of Lakshmaṇasena. But their view cannot also be upheld for three reasons :—(I) The accession of none of the predecessors of Lakshmaṇasena can be placed in 1119 A. D. for (1) Vallāla, the immediate predecessor of Lakshmaṇa came to the throne according to the *Adbhūtasāgara* in 1159 A. D. and these scholars do not disbelieve the testimony of the *Dānasāgara* and the *Adbhūtasāgara* and (2) whether we read the date in the Barrackpur grant as 32 or 61 Vijayasena's date of accession cannot be placed in the year 1119 A. D. And as Vijayasena was the contemporary of Rāmapāla and as the time of Rāmapāla falls in the closing years of the eleventh and the earlier years of the twelfth

¹ Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's Report on the Search of Sanskrit MSS. during 1887-88 & 1889-91.

century A. D., Hemantasena, supposing he was a ruler of Bengal, must have come to the throne much earlier than 1119 A. D. Anyhow, this date cannot be the initial regnal year of either Hemantasena or his son Vijayasena.

(II) If the era was founded by some of the ancestors of Lakshmanasena of Bengal why did not at least Lakshmanasena and his successors use the era? All the Sena kings of Bengal used regnal years and there is no evidence of a continuous reckoning by this Sena dynasty.

(III) The era is distinctly called Lakshmanasamvat. If the era was founded not by Lakshmanasena but by some ancestor of his, why was it all along associated with the name of Lakshmanasena? No explanation has been yet adduced.

The third view¹ which alleges that the era was founded in the twelfth century A. D. to commemorate the *atitarājya* of Lakshmanasena cannot be tenable for the following consideration :—

I. There is no evidence of the use of any such era in Bengal in the first century of its existence.

II. Lakshmanasena was not certainly the last great king of his dynasty. Why should the people commemorate the *atitarājya* of Lakshmanasena and ignore the Pravardhamāna-vijayarājya of his sons who fought successfully against the Gargas and the Yavanas, as the Madanpāda and Edilpur copper plates inform us?

III. Why should the era be ignored by Lakshmanasena's own sons and be perpetuated by the kings of a neighbouring province?

The fourth and the latest view² that the era marks the birth of Lakshmanasena cannot also be supported for we have as yet got no evidence of an era marking the birth of a prince.

¹ Balu Ramaprasad Chanda expresses his opinion in *Gauḍa Rājamāla*, p. 64, and Dr. R. C. Majumdar in *J. & Proc., A. S. B.*, 1921.

² Babu Dinesh Ch. Bhattacharyya, M.A., is the chief exponent of this view. *Ind. Ant.*, August, 1922.

The fifth and the last view, which alone seems to us to be the soundest of all, is held by Dr. H. C. Raychowdhury.¹ He is of opinion that "the origin of Lakshmanasena era is to be sought not in the Sena dynasty of Vijayapur (Bengal) but in the Sena dynasty of Pithi (Behar)." And this is his cogent argument for holding this view :—

The Sena Kings of Bengal never used the era which has so often been ascribed to them. The dates found in the inscriptions of the Sena kings of Bengal are in regnal years and not in the years of any era as these dates do not form a connected series.

On the other hand, the era was used in Behar and was connected with the Sena royal house of Pithi which according to Mr. Jayaswal means Magadha. From the Janibigha inscription, epigraphic records at Bodh Gaya and the palm-leaf manuscripts of Nepal it is clear enough that "there was a line of Sena kings in Magadha who used the dates of Lakshmanasena era and these dates form a connected series." And it is held by eminent scholars like Fleet that "Any era may be introduced in a country in which it was not founded. But no era can have been founded in a country in which it was never used."

Therefore we see that as, on the one hand, there is no doubt about the fact that the era never originated in the Sena royal house of Bengal, so on the other hand, there is a strong possibility that the era was founded in Behar by some member of the Sena family of Magadha.

¹ Lakshmanasena Era, by Dr. H. C. Raychowdhury, Sir Asutosh Mukerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, Vol. III, *Orientalia*, pp. 1-5.

APPENDIX B.

The Date of the Nudiāh Raid.

The exact date for the raid of Nudiāh by Bākht-yār-khālġ has long been a matter of controversy among scholars. Thus Raverty, the translator of the *Tabakāt-i-Nāsiri*, gave the date as 1193 A.D. while Blochman gave it as 1197-1198. Again, according to Dr. Thomas the raid took place in 1202 A.D. But Stewart asserts that it must have taken place in 1203 A.D. On the other hand, Mr. R. D. Banerji thinks that Nudiāh was sacked in 1200 A.D.¹ But before we for ourselves come to any conclusion, let us see what is the exact statement of Minhāj regarding it. According to him the raid took place after A.H. 589 and some years before A.H. 601, that is, between A.D. 1193 and A.D. 1205. Minhāj also adds the important statement that Lakshmaṇasena died shortly after the event. Now as we know from the colophon of the *Saduktikarṇāmrta* that Lakshmaṇasena was still ruling in 1206 A.D. it appears that the raid took place nearer to this date. Hence the view of Stewart who says that the raid took place in 1203 A.D. seems to be correct.

¹ Bānglār Itihāsa, Part II, p. 15.

APPENDIX C.

The Identification of Vijayapura mentioned in the Pavanadūta of Dhoyī.

It is urged by some scholars that the 30th verse of the *Pavanadūta* shows that the messenger Wind crossed the Bhāgīrathī and went to North Bengal where according to them Vijayapura is to be located. But we have carefully considered the verse and failed to find in it any reference either to the crossing of the Ganges or to the North Bengal.

The *Pavanadūta* describes all the countries through which the Wind passes from Pāṇḍya to *Suhma*. But there is not a single reference to Varendrī or Puṇḍra, the distinctive names of North Bengal. Some scholars, however, failing to find any reference to Varendrī or Puṇḍra in the *Pavanadūta*, takes *Gauḍī kṣhaunī* (v. 5) as equivalent to Varendrī. But to regard Gauḍa and Varendra as synonymous terms is an assumption which is contradicted by the evidence of our ancient literature. The *Prabodhachandrodaya*, for instance, places Rāḍhā, that is West Bengal, in Gauḍa. Thus it says in Act II, p. 28 : *Gauḍaṃ rāshṭraṃ anuttamaṃ tatrāpi Rāḍhā purī*, etc. Bāṇa in his *Harshacharit* calls Śaśāṅka of Karṇa-suvarṇa (Murshidabad district according to Watters) a Gauḍa king and Yuan-chwang clearly distinguishes the realm of this Gauḍa king from Puṇḍravardhana or North Bengal. In the Haraha inscription (Ep.Ind., Vol. XIV, pp. 110 ff) the Gauḍas are described as *samudrāśraya*. It is obvious thus that the Gauḍa territory included West Bengal—the *Suhma* of the *Pavanadūta* and was not the exclusive designation of North Bengal—nay in the time of Yuan-chwang the Gauḍa realm was clearly distinguished from North Bengal.

Again, some scholars contend on the strength of stanzas 5 and 36 of the *Pavanadūta* that Vijayapura was situated in

Gauḍa and that this Gauḍa represented some region around modern Gaur in the Maldah district, so as to include Vijayanagara (in the Rajshahi district) with which Vijayapura is sought to be identified. But the term Gauḍa in stanza 5 does not denote any small district like the one just referred to but rather the Gauḍa kingdom itself. This is clear from stanza 101 where Lakshmaṇasena is designated *Gauḍendra* which could not mean 'the lord of the district of Gauḍa' corresponding to modern Maldah and surrounding regions, but must mean 'the lord of the whole kingdom of Gauḍa which owned the sway of the Sena dynasty.' This view, again, does not obviate the difficulty already adverted to, namely, that the messenger Wind has nowhere been asked in the poem to cross the Ganges so that Vijayapura can be identified with Vijayanagara which was on the other side of that river. Again, according to this view, that is, if Vijayapura is taken as chief place of the Gauḍa district we shall be compelled to suppose that in the case of *Śūhmadeśa* alone Dhoyī has not thought fit to mention its principal town though he has composed many a stanza for the glorification of its monuments.

APPENDIX D.

The Identification of Vijayasena with Vijayarāja mentioned in the Rāmacharita of Sandhyākaranandi.

While discussing the political history we have suggested the identification of the Sena king Vijaya, father of Vallālasena, with Vijayarāja of Sandhyākaranandī's *Rāmacharita* who helped Rāmapāla to regain his throne. We have also suggested there that king Vijayasena defeated Madanapāla, second son of Rāmapāla, and made himself the paramount sovereign of Gauḍa. Thus according to our view Vijaya was a contemporary of three generations of Pāla sovereigns, namely, Rāmapāla, his son Kumārapāla and Madanapāla and Kumārapāla's son Gopāla III who came between Kumārapāla and Madanapāla. This is by no means a unique case. Amoghavarsha of the Rāshtrakūṭa dynasty was a contemporary of three generations of Pratihāra sovereigns, namely, Nāgabhaṭa, Rāmabhadra and Bhoja. The poet Umāpatidhara was a contemporary of three generations of Sena sovereigns, namely, Vijaya, Vallāla and Lakshmaṇa. There is no need of multiplying instances. But it may be argued that as Vijaya was a contemporary of Rāmapāla, Kumārapāla, Gopāla III and Madanapāla, his reign period must have covered the reign periods of Rāmapāla, at least 42 + Kumārapāla, at least 4 + Gopāla a very short time + Madanapāla at least 8 years = 54 + years. If Messrs. N. K. Bhaṭṭasāli and Dineshchandra Bhattacharyya are to be believed Vijayasena's reign really covered that period for according to them the Barrackpur grant contains the date 61. Some scholars, however, read

the date as 32. Even if this date be correct there is nothing to show that the year 32 was the last date of Vijaya and that king might have continued to rule long after the issuing of the Barrackpur grant. Moreover, it should be noted, that Rāmapāla's expedition to regain his throne with the help of Vijaya might have been undertaken some years after his accession. Consequently Vijaya's reign need not cover all the 42 years of Rāmapāla's reign. It is thus clear that there is no inherent improbability of Vijayasena being a contemporary of Rāmapāla and his sons and grandson. Let us now see what evidence there is for regarding Vijayasena as a contemporary of Rāmapāla. It has been conclusively proved by Drs. H. C. Raychaudhury and R. C. Majumdar that Rāmapāla's reign could not have ended till some years elapsed after 1096 A. D. He was, therefore, a contemporary of Nānyadeva for whom Drs. Kielhorn and Smith give the date 1037 A. D. Now we know from the Deopara inscription that Nānya was a contemporary of Vijayasena. Again according to the *Adbhūtasāgara*, the accession of Vallāla, son of Vijaya, took place in 1159-60 A. D. Even those who reject the evidence of this work do not say that Vallāla ascended the throne after 1159-60 A. D. So there is a concensus of opinion that Vallāla ascended the throne not later than 1159-60 A. D. His father Vijayasena ruled certainly for at least 32 and probably for at least 61 years (Barrackpur grant). Therefore his accession must have taken place not later, but perhaps much earlier than $(1159-60) - 32 = 1127-1128$ A. D. In view of this fact and in view of his synchronism with Nānyadeva (Deopara inscription) for whom we have the date 1097 A.D. is it unreasonable to hold that Vijaya was a contemporary of Rāmapāla? Moreover, it is stated in the Deopara inscription that Vijaya was a contemporary not only of Nānya but also of Vira and Vardhana. Now it is known from the *Rāma-charita* that among those who helped Rāmapāla to regain his throne there were besides Vijayarāja two princes named

Viraguna of Kotātavi and Vardhana of Kośāmbī. The obvious conclusion would be that Vijaya, Vardhana and Vira of the Deopara inscription are identical with Vijaya, Vira and Vardhana of the Rāmacharita. To deny this would be to assume that there were in the latter part of the eleventh and the first part of the twelfth century two Vijayas, two Viras and two Vardhanas in the Gauda territory and its neighbourhood. Such a conclusion, though not absolutely impossible, is highly improbable.

APPENDIX E.

The Conquest of Kāśī and Prayāga by Lakshmaṇasena.

Some critics urge that the account of Lakshmaṇasena's victory in the Kāśī-Prayāga region is incredible in view of the Gāharwār records which testify to the advance of the Gāharwār power as far as Monghyr. But if this line of argument were followed, it would lead us to reject the account of the early Chālukya victories in the Kāñchi region, because, forsooth, a Pallava king of Kāñchi once captured Vātāpi the Chālukya capital. We should also reject, by following a similar reasoning, the account of Dharmapāla's conquest of Kanauj, because forsooth, Vatsarāja, Nāgabhaṭa and Bhoja claimed victories over Gauda and Bengal. Again this sort of argument would also make us disbelieve the stories of French advance to Berlin in the nineteenth century in view of the Prussian occupation of Paris shortly after Waterloo. In fact, we should not forget that when two neighbouring kings fight with each other victory turns now to one side and now to the other.
